

the Pope and Council expressing: Thirty Proprietors or Cla-

Page 26, line 28, for *Terrion* read *Pisano*, p. 76, l. 9, for *is r. d.* p. 97, l. 21, *r. Presbyters*, p. 93, l. 30, *r. Roman*, p. 94, l. 2, for *or r. of*, p. 107, l. 1, for *Geiberr Vandalis*, p. 110, l. 4, *dele* and, p. 115, l. 13, for *Com. r. Corn.*, p. 123, l. 11, *r. Libraries*, p. 156, l. 24, *r. Grapauke*.

Page 18, l. 1, for *most real* r. *Moral*. p. 20, l. 5, r. *Gorgians*. p. 29, l. 16, r. *Sirmium*. p. 37, l. 5, for *find* r. *said*.

The Contents.

placed the Authority Universal and the Institution in
the Pope and Councils: Thirty Properties of Chri-
stianity. The 1st about the Religion of their
Fathers. The 2nd about the Authority of the Councils.
The 3rd about the Properties of the Faith, and how
they are to be preserved.

CHAP.

ERRATA.

Page 26. line 28. for *Torricen* read *Pisanus*. p. 76. l. 9. for *in r. 2.* p. 97.
l. 21. r. *Presbyters*. p. 93. l. 20. r. *Roman*. p. 94. l. 2. for *or r. of.* p. 107.
l. 1. for *Gubert* r. *Vandals*. p. 110. l. 4. *dele and.* p. 115. l. 13. for *Com. r. Corn.*
p. 123. l. 11. r. *Libraries*. p. 156. l. 28. r. *Gregory*.

Errata, in Roman Tradition, &c.

Page 18. l. 1. for *most real r. Moral*. p. 20. l. 5. r. *Gorgians*. p. 29. l. 16.
r. *Sirmione*. p. 37. l. 5. for *find a. said.*

ROMAN
TRADITION
EXAMINED,

As it is urged as

INFALLIBLE
AGAINST

All Mens SENSES, REASON, the Holy SCRIPTURE, the TRADITION and Present JUDGMENT of the far greatest part of the Universal Church,

IN THE POINT OF
TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

In Answer to a Book called

A Rational Discourse of Transubstantiation.

Richard Baxter

Printed in the Year, 1676.

ROMAN

TRADITION

EXAMINED

And compared with

THE ALLEGED

ORIGINAL

OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW, THE GOSPEL OF MARK, THE GOSPEL OF LUKE, THE GOSPEL OF JOHN, THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, THE EPISTLES OF THE APOSTLES, AND THE REVELATION OF JOHN THE APOSTLE AND PROPHET.

TRANSLATED BY

JOHN W. BAKER

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE

Printed in the Year 1876.

ROMAN TRADITION

EXAMINED, &c.

AMong many Books that lately came forth, of somewhat the like tendency, there is one called [*A Rational Discourse concerning Transubstantiation, in a Letter to a Person of Honour, from a Master of Arts of the University of Cambridge.*] Alas, for the unhappiness of those Persons of Honour that have such Teachers and Counsellors as this! Could they have no better? or would they not? If they chose them their misery is just.

The Title Paraphrased is [*A Rational Discourse against Sense.*] But the strain of this, and abundance Written, by Men of the like ingeny, tell us convincingly, that while they distrust all their Senses, and would have all the World distrust them, and deny them, they are so confident of their *Thinking, Inventing, and Talking Faculties*, that they dare set them in Battel against the Senses of all Mankind, and cherish some hopes to get the Victory. And verily, it is a wonderful victory that such Mens Tongues have got already, if all the Princes, Lords, Doctors, and all other People that go for Papists, do really believe Transubstantiation; and if some be not in the right, who think that there is not one hearty and compleat Papist in the World, unless implicate Believers may be called such, who believe as the Church doth, though they know not

what ; but that the Masters of the Game are but the Makers or Predicants of a Faith for others, which never was their own, and that they generate but their like, even worldly dissemblers, and convert only Mens Tongues by the power of the Sword, and not their Hearts by all their Oratory. And I must confess, that when I have heard a prophane Swearer, Curser, Railer, Drunkard, Whoremonger, plead for Transubstantiation, I have thought of peaceable *Melancthon's* words [*You Italians maintain that Christ is in the Sacrament, when you believe not that he is in Heaven.*]

But the devout words and confidence of this *Master of Arts* maketh me think that he believeth himself, and that dissembling is not the Art that he is Master of ; but though he be as he saith [*Non ignara mali*] yet he may be *Ignarus mali*, ignorant of his Error and of the Mischief which he would do. Indeed if Men will needs believe that Night is Day, and Day is Night, we might satisfie our selves with our compassion for their weakness, without any importunate publick contradiction ; but our case with such Men as this, is such as prohibireth such patient silence : For, the same Religion which teacheth them to deny the *Senses* of Mankind, doth teach them to *Exterminate, Burn, Excommunicate, and Damn* all those that will not do as they do, but will believe their Senses ; and also to depose those Temporal Lords that will not exterminate such from their Dominions.

Two things yet I must note, that make me doubt whether the Author be so honest in his dealing as I could wish him, and as a Man that talketh of God and *Jesus Christ* should be. 1. That he so *blindly, or fraudulently* stateth the Question. 2. That he taketh so little notice of the Books and Arguments that are Written against his Cause,

as if they needed no Answer, when we suppose that they have put the Error of Transubstantiation so far past all rational doubt, that it is scarce possible for a Man that hath understandingly, and seriously read them, to believe it: It is but lately that a small Book, on that Subject, was published by *R. Baxter*, Dedicated to the Duke of *Lauderdale*, called, [*Full and easie satisfaction, which is the true Religion,*] which all the Papists in the World can never give a rational Answer to; and therefore this Man dare scarce take notice of such, lest it should bring them to the notice of his Reader. But doth he think that we must not know that his Book is Answered before it was Written, because he will take no notice of it? or must we therefore repeat the same things again?

The *Roman* Article of Faith is, that [*There is a change made of the whole substance of the Bread into the Body of Christ, and of the whole substance of wine into his Blood*] so that our Controversie with them hath two parts. 1. Whether after Consecration there be no longer *Bread* or *Wine*? 2. Whether that which was *Bread* and *Wine* is then turned into the very *Flesh* and *Blood* of *Christ*? Now this *Rational Discourser* confoundeth these together, and in his progress dealeth so little with the first part, as if he were afraid that it should be taken notice of.

The Reader must farther note. 1. That it is none of our Controversie [*whether the whole substance of the Bread and wine be Relatively changed into the Representative Flesh and Blood of Christ which he once had, and offered in Sacrifice for us on the Cross, as the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world;* For, this is our Doctrine:] But it is, *whether there be a physical change of the substance of the Bread and wine into the natural substance*
of

of the *Flesh and Blood of Christ which is now glorified.*

2. That the Controversie is not at all of the *Real Presence of Christs glorified Body*, whether it be in this or that place, or not? but whether the *Bread and wine* be *changed into it*? For, many Protestants (Lutherans, and others) do profess that we have no certain clear Conception of the nature of a glorified Body; and consequently as they cannot judge of the Locality and Presence of a Spirit, so neither of the Locality and Presence of a *Spiritual Body*: They know not whether the now prevailing Philosophy be not true, that Light is a Body, and Solar Light is the emanant substance of the Sun it self, whose Center is in the Heavens: And if its very substance be so extensive as to fill all the Air betwixt Heaven and Earth, (and more,) and if the Light of an hundred Candles can be all together in one Room, they are uncertain what are the Limits of Christs Spiritual Body, or whether it be either of a more ignoble nature than the Sun, or of less extent: And most of the *Greek Fathers* thought Spiritual Bodies (if not Spirits themselves) were *Fire*. And as our *Sense* or *Reason* cannot tell us whether or no there be now an Angel in this Room, so neither can either of them tell us whether Christs Spiritual Body be here: This therefore they leave to God that knoweth it, and will have to be no no part of the Controversie.

1. For the first part, *whether there be true Bread and wine after Consecration*, as many others have fully proved the affirmative, so particularly the foresaid Author briefly hath proved it past all rational denial. 1. From the *Senses of all Mankind*; an Argument fortified by twenty subordinate convincing Arguments against the deniers of Sense; where the Papists Answers are refuted.

2. He hath proved the *Contradictions* of the Doctrine of
 Tran-

Transubstantiation. 3. He hath shewed that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation asserteth *one and thirty Miracles*, with *twenty miraculous aggravations*; and hath fully proved from Scripture that these Miracles are fictitious. 4. He hath proved from many express Texts of Scripture, that *it is Bread after the Consecration*. 5. And also that the Scripture it self doth fully teach us to expound *This is my Body*, as we do, and not as the Papiſts do. 6. He proveth that the very nature of a *Sacrament*, even as *Aquinas* defineth it, is inconsistent with Transubstantiation. 7. And Lastly, he proveth the *Novelty* of your Doctrine, and that the antient Writers were against it; which *Albertinus*, *Pet. Molinæus de Novil. Papiſmi*, the late *Morning Lectures* of the *Nonconformists* against *Popery*, and many others have proved at large. But these things our *Discourſer Rationally diſſembleth*, lest if he should answer them it would appear to be no *Rational Discourse*. But let us hear what the Rationality is which he pretendeth to.

His Discourse consisteth of three Assertions, and their pretended Proof, and a short Answer to some Scraps of Objection.

His first Assertion is, that [*It is possible to the Omnipotent Power of God, to change the substance of Bread and wine into the substance of our blessed Saviour's Body and Blood.*] And he saith, that [*This his Adversaries generally grant.*] And yet, if he know what they say, he knoweth that they maintain that Transubstantiation is a Doctrine of *Contradictions*, and that God cannot make *two Contradictories true*. They easily grant him that God can do every thing which belongeth to *Power* to do: Though we are not fond of his phrase [*Omnipotent Powers*] no more than of [*wise wisdom*] or [*strong Strength*] or *great*

great Greatness,] yet taking his *meaning*, we grant that Omnipotency is never stalled with difficulties: Though God cannot *lye*, nor cannot hate goodness, nor love sin, nor make Contradictions true, that is not for want of Power, but because he is perfect: He cannot be ignorant, or evil; and he cannot chuse but be God.

I suppose that he taketh not Christ's Body, though spiritual, to be meerly, or properly *Spirit*, or (as they speak) *immaterial*; and so that it is none of his meaning, that God can turn Bread into *immaterial Spirit*; which yet I would not have said that he cannot do: But it is turning one *Body* into another which he calleth *Possible*. And that God can do this by *Apposition*, or *Union*, adding one Body to another, I cannot deny: But these following Contradictions we take not for Possibilities.

1. For one *Body* to be turned into another *pre-existent*, by *apposition*, (the *Form* of the changed Body ceasing, but not the *Matter*;) and yet that the *pre-existent Body* should not be *increased* by the *apposition*, this is a Contradiction. As in Numbers, for two to be added to ten, and yet the Number be still but ten, is a Contradiction: So for all the Bread that is Consecrated to lose only its *Form*, and the *Matter* to be changed into the *Body of Christ*, by *apposition*, and yet Christ's Body to be *no bigger*, is a Contradiction; unless some pre-existent part of Christ's Body vanish, and it be diminished by loss, as much as it receiveth by *apposition*.

You say, that by *Concoction* we our selves turn Bread and wine into *Flesh and Blood* daily: But note, that the *Form* only of the *Bread and Wine* ceaseth, and the *Matter* receiveth a new *Form* in us, and by *apposition* increaseth our *Flesh and Blood*; and that our bulk increaseth not alway, is because some parts vanish, as others are added;
and

and being in a continual Flux or Mutation, we have little, if any, of the same Flesh and Blood this Year, that we had the last, or a few Years ago. And doth Christ's Body thus change, and receive addition and diminution? or, doth it grow bigger at the pleasure of the Priest?

2. If you say that this is not your ordinary belief, but that the *very Matter*, as well as *Form* of the *Bread and Wine* ceaseth; I add, that it is a *Contradiction*, that the *very Matter* should *cease to be*, and yet be *changed into another Body*. The *ceasing* of *Matter* is *Annihilation*: And to say that it is *annihilated*, and yet *changed into another thing*, is a *Contradiction*: As *Matter* is denominated from the *Form*, when the *Form* ceaseth, the *Matter* ceaseth to be the *Matter* of that *Form*; but unless annihilated it is still the *Matter* of *another Form*. For one *Body* to be *annihilated*, and *another* to take its place, is not for the *one* to be changed into the *other*. *Annihilating* and *Transubstantiating* are *Contradictory*.

3. It is a *Contradiction* for *Bread and Wine* to be turned into Christ's *Flesh and Blood*, and made his *Body*, whose *Body* is not *Flesh*, or *Blood*; unless he have two *Bodies*, or one consisting of marvelous dissimilar and heterogeneous parts. That Christ's *Body* in *Heaven* is not *Flesh and Blood* at all, must be confessed by all true Expositors of 1 Cor. 15. 50. *Flesh and Blood cannot enter into the Kingdom of God*. The Context sheweth that it is not *Sin*, but natural proper *Flesh and Blood* that is there meant: And who will believe that glorified *Bodies* are *Flesh and Blood*, whoever well considered, 1. *what Flesh and Blood is*, and for what use? 2. In what *Region* glorified *Bodies* dwell; and that the *Inhabitants* are every where *Connatural* to their *Region*. 3. That the Text saith *They are Spiritual Bodies*.

And if Christ's Body in Heaven be no *Flesh or Blood*; and his Body on Earth be both; then either he hath two Bodies; or very heterogeneous parts of one.

4. It is a Contradiction to say that there are *Accidents*, which are not the Accidents of any Substance, (either of Bread, Christ's Body, or any thing else :) For, *Accidentis esse est in esse*, it is relative: The foresaid Author p. 96. hath told you, 1. For *Quantity*, a Pound, or Inch of *nothing*; a long, or broad, or thick *nothing*; a Pint, or Quart of *nothing*, are Contradictions. 2. For the Number of Wafers, or Cups of Wine, to put twenty, or forty, or an hundred *nothings*, is a Contradiction. 3. For Figure, *alround*, or *square nothing*, is a Contradiction. 4. A *sweet nothing*; a *sharp*, or *austere nothing*, instead of Wine, is a Contradiction. So an *odoriferous nothing*; a *rough*, or *smooth nothing*; a *red*, or a *white nothing*; a *nothing* seated on the *Altar* more than another place, &c. all these are Contradictions. And he hath there shewed you that it is a Contradiction for *nothing* to have *real effects*; for *nothing* really to *nourish*, and become *Flesh and Blood* in him that eateth it; yea, for *nothing* to be eaten; for *nothing* to turn to *real excrements*; for *nothing* to make a Man drunk, as Wine doth: God can do all that are works of Power; but to verify these Contradictories, is no work of Power.

6. God cannot *lye*, saith the Apostle, and Nature it self; else Faith had no certainty at all, the formal Object failing. To *lye*, is to give *false* deceiving *signs* of the *Matter*, and of the *Authors mind*: And if God's *Natural Revelation* to Sense it self be *false*, yea to all *Mens Senses*; doth not that make a *lye* as well as a *false Word*, *Prophecie*, or *Vision*? God's *Natural Revelations* are known by all Men certainly to be his own, and so are
not

not the Prophetical: All know that God made Mans Sense to be the *Natural* perceiver of sensible Objects, that as sensed, they might be perceived naturally by the Intellect: And supposing the *Object, Sense, Intellect, and Medium* duly qualified, if now we be deceived, *Natural Revelation* faileth, or is false, and we have no remedy: So that to make God's Natural Revelation to Sense, and by Sense to the Intellect, to be false to all the sound Senses in the World, is to make God, blasphemously, the greatest Liar in the World, and this God cannot be, because he is God.

And now, I pray you what doth the *Doctrine* of *Rarefaction* and *Condensation* make against any of this that I have said? Apply it to any one of these Contradictions, and try whether it will prove them no Contradictions? Though your definitions of them are ridiculous, (*viz.* that *Rarefaction* is a little Matter under a great Quantity, and *Condensation* is a great deal of Matter under a little Quantity; and this you say is the ancient and commonly received Definition) yet this, were it so, is nothing to our business. *Rarefaction* maketh the Quantity of Matter no more, but only more diffused, or extensive as to Space; and Space and Quantity are not all one: And *Condensation* maketh not the Matter to be of less Quantity, but only to possess less Space: You shew how great a Philosopher you are. But doth *Rarefaction* make Accidents without a Subject, or Effects without a real Cause; or Matter to be added to Matter without augmenting it, or the same Matter to be changed into other Matter, and yet cease to be the same Matter it was; or any of the rest.

And what if a Spirit, which is circumscriptively in no place, may be said to be definitively, or operatively, in many places at once? Will you say the same of a Body, and

to make *Body* and *Spirit* to be the same? A *Spirit* is *invisible*, and so is not *Matter*; but yet I make not this the Controversie. I know not how near Christ's *Body* is to a *Spirit*, which is called *spiritual*; but if it be *material*, and yet in many places at once, it must be by *Parts*; one *Part* in one place, and another part in another place. For a *material Body* not to possess its proper place according to its *Quantity* and *Parts*, is a *Contradiction*: And whatever you will say of Christ's *Heavenly Body*, sure you will not say that his supposed *Flesh and Blood* is not *material*, or a true *Body*: And therefore either Christ hath as *many Bodies*, or else as *many Pieces*, or *Parts* of *one Body*, as there are *Consecrated pieces* of *Bread*, perhaps many *Thousand Miles* distant from each other. Yet I will confess to you, that as if a *Thousand visible Apples* could grow on one *spiritual*, or *invisible Tree*, they would be all *Parts* of that one *Tree*; so if you could prove, that a *Thousand material visible Hosts* are united by apposition to one *spiritual invisible Body* of Christ as *Parts*, they would all be *Parts* of that *one Body*, but marvelously heterogeneal. But what's all this to the fore said *Contradictions*?

But you have recourse to the *Miracle* of Christ's *Incarnation*, to salve the *Objection* fetcht from *sense*: But what mean you by that? Did you think that it is *Miracles* that we object against? or that every *Miracle* is a *Contradiction*, or contrary to well-qualified *Sense*? What is there in Christ's *Incarnation*, *Conception*, or *Birth*, which is a *Contradiction*, or against *Sense*, or *Reason*? There is indeed much that is *above* the reach of *Reason* without *Revelation*; but nothing that is *against Sense*, or *informed Reason*: For, what should it be? Is it impossible for God to impregnate a *Virgin*, any more than to make

make *Eve* ? Or is it impossible for God to take a humane Nature into Union with the Divine, when as all things are so nearly dependant on him, that he is, as they say, *intimior intimo nostro* ? and it is harder to confute that Platonist, who taketh God to be the Soul of the Universe, and all things to be as it were his Body and Accidents, than to prove it impossible for him to be united to *one*. What else meant your Fanaticks, *Fryar Benedict. Angl. in Regula perfect.* to make it Mans perfection to believe that *there is nothing but God* ?

And for the Doctrine of the Trinity, it is no more a Contradiction, than to hold that the *Mental Nature* or *Spirit* is informed by a *Vertue* or *Faculty*, which is *One essentially*, and *Three respectively*, as to the *Acts* and *Objects*, viz. The *Facultas-vitalis-activa, Intellectiva & Volitiva* ; or, that the *sensitive Soul* hath a formal Faculty, which is *One and Three*, viz. *Activa, Perceptiva, Appetitiva* ; or, that *Fire* hath a *Trin-uae* power, *Motive, Illuminative, & Calefactive*. When *Trinity in Unity* is imprinted on all *Active Natures*, will you find out a Contradiction in it ? If it were *Three Essences*, and yet *but One Essence* ; or *Three Persons*, and yet *but One Person*, in the same sense and respect, it were a Contradiction. And is here any deception of our well disposed Senses, or any Lye ? Because God hath many Works which surpass the power of natural second Causes, in their ordinary way of working ; and because he hath many which we cannot know without supernatural Revelation, will you thence infer that he may be the great Deceiver of the World, and may deliver Contradictions as his Truth ? As if *Miracles* were all *Lyes* and *Contradictions*.

You say that *Christ appeared to S. Mary in the shape of a Gardner.*

Gardner. And what of that? Either *distance*, or want of *light*, or *observation* did hinder her from discerning his proper *Visage*, and then its nothing to our *Cale*; or else he really *assumed a Visage* different from that which she had formerly seen: And if so, here was no deception of *Sense*, any more than in the apparition of an *Angel*; nor no more than a *Masked person* doth deceive anothers *Sense*, because he would not be known; nor any more than when one knoweth not his old *Friend*, when *Age* or *Sickness* hath changed him.

Pag. 4. You did with a necessary craft pass over your *Doctors Explications* of the *Mystery*, as knowing that they do but detect the *Contradictions*.

You here tell us of [*some of the learnedest of the English Clergie (or Church) that confess the holy Eucharist, after Consecration, to be really and truly our Saviours Body, and therefore fall down before it, and adore it; and for this cause disown the New Rubrick of the Common-Prayer-Book, which saith, our Lords Body is in Heaven, and not on the Altar. These Doctors will tell you that they acknowledge the thing, only they dare not be so bold as the Romanists to determine the manner. And one of the learnedest of them, Mr. Thorndike, asks, why cannot our Saviour appear to us in what shape he pleaseth, in the shape of a Gardner, or if it so please him, in the shape of Bread and wine?*]

To which I answer, 1. That *New Rubrick* is but the *Old* restored: So you call our *Religion New*. 2. Those may well pass with you for the *most learned*, who please you best, while you confer *Degrees*. 3. Such as you teach men to refuse *Kneeling* at the *Receiving* of the *Sacrament*, (as one of you that is mentioned in the *Life of Bishop Hall*) by thus perswading men, that the *English Clergy* believe *Transubstantiation*, and adore accordingly.

ly. 4. Either you speak *true* or *false* of the *learnedest* of the *English Clergie*: If *false*, it is an ill shelter for your other *Falshoods*: If *true*, what regard should we have of the judgment of such Clergy-men, as declare their *Assent and Consent* to all things contained in and prescribed by the *Book of Common-Prayer*, and *Articles of Religion*, and yet *disown the Rubrick*, and believe *Transubstantiation*, and adore *the Eucharist as Christs Body*? Why do you not call such the *Roman Clergie*, rather than the *English Clergie*, if they differ from you but only in a want of boldness to determine the manner, while they acknowledge the thing? What if a Bishop *Bramhall* will have the *Pope* to be *Principium Unitatis*, and take *Grotius* to be of the mind of the Church of England, (who would have *Rome* to be the *Mistress Church*, and the *Pope* the *Universal Governour*, according to the *Canons of Councils*, even the *Council of Trent*;) must we therefore stoop to such mens judgment? Or might you not as well tell us, that *Cassander*, or *Mileterius*, yea or *Bellarmine*, were of your mind? And whats that to us?

Your second Assertion is [If our Saviour would have left us his sacred Body and Blood, instead of all the sacrifices of Sheep and Oxen, under the *Mosaical Dispensations*, to be offered up by *Christian Priests*, and to be fed upon by the *Christian People*, it would have been a favour worthy of his excessive love to mankind, by reason of the innumerable benefits, &c.

Ans. 1. If he had only left us his Body and Blood, he had not deceived all mens Senses, nor imposed any Contradictions on our Faith.

2. If he had done so, his choice would have taught us to take it for a benefit, because his Wisdom is fittest to discern, and to denominate it.

3. To

3. To leave us that Body which was *true Flesh and Blood*, capable of *breaking, shedding, pain, and death*, is one thing; and to give us his *glorified Body*, is another thing: This is not capable of *breaking, shedding, pain, or death*, being a *spiritual, immortal, incorruptible Body*. Therefore indeed, the Eucharist is *Christs Body and Blood* representative, but not of such a Body as he hath now glorified, but such as was truly *Flesh and Blood*, which he once offered; the benefits of which Sacrifice are really given us in and by the Eucharist. But to have left us a Body to be broken and slain, which cannot be slain, and *Flesh and Blood* which is not *Flesh and Blood*, but spiritual, is a Contradiction. But if Christ have two Bodies, or one consisting of parts spiritual, glorified, and of real *Flesh and Blood*, then indeed one part of this may be still a Sacrifice.

4. But taking it (as you here do) abstractedly from Gods Will, and as in it self considered; what reason can you give us, why *Christ's* true offering of himself in Sacrifice once for all, should not be as great a Benefit and Love-Token, as our offering him daily? The holy Scripture (*Heb. 10. 14.* telleth us, that [by one offering he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified] and *v. 10, 11, 12.* that by the will of God we are sanctified through the once offering of the Body of Jesus Christ: and every Priest standeth daily ministering, and offering oftentimes the same Sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this Man after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins, for ever *sate down on the right-hand of God.*] But you will tell us what a benefit it would be to offer Christ often? Do you really break, wound, hurt, and kill him in your offering, or do you not? If not, how is it a Sacrifice? and how is he the slain Lamb of God that taketh away the

the sins of the World? And what Sacrificing, or satisfactory use can it have, to be offered without breaking, hurt, or death? Is it a *living*, or *dead* Body of Christ that you offer? If a *living Body unhurt*, it is none of the Sacrifice the Scripture mentioneth of Christ: And how is it propitiatory for sin? If it be a *dead Body*, was it ever alive? If not, 'tis not Christ's: If yea, who *killeth him*? And if it be his living, glorified, impassible Body that you offer, how unlike is that to Christ's offering? And why calleth he the *Bread and Wine, his Body and Blood*, which a glorified Body is not? It's most evident that Christ speaketh of his *suffering Body*, and not of his *glorified Body* that cannot suffer: And if so, shall we tell God what a benefit it would be to *us*, if every Priest may become as the *Jews*, the killer of Jesus Christ; that he may break his real Flesh, and let out his real Blood? Christ did not this himself. He consented to be killed, but he killed not himself. And what Man of Sense can doubt but he speaketh of a Representative *Body, and Blood* at his last Supper, when his real Body was not broken, nor slain, nor his Blood, till after; unless Christ had two Bodies, one first killed by himself, and eaten by his Disciples; and the other killed after by the *Jews*.

I marvel whether any Papist believe in his Conscience, that *Peter*, and *John*, and the rest, did believe at that Supper, that they did eat Christ's real Flesh, and drink his Blood? What, they that did not understand before his Resurrection that he was to dye as a Sacrifice for sin, and rise again, though he oft told it them? For so expressly saith the Text, *John 12. 16. Luke 18. 31, 32, 33, 34. and 24. 20, 21.* If it had been believed by them, why is there no mention of any of their wonder at such a Mystery, as that their Saviour should at once be in their

Belly, and in their sight? I can scarce believe that Man that faith he believeth that they believed that then they did eat Christ's very Flesh and Blood. But perhaps some of you will take up a late start Conceit, that Christ at his last Supper did not *celebrate*, but only *institute* that Sacrament: which I am ashamed to stay to answer.

For our parts, we take it for a greater mercy that Christ doth reconcile us to God, and put away our sins, by once offering himself in Sacrifice, instead of the old Sacrifices that must be often repeated, than if he had bid us kill, or break, or offer his real Body and Blood often. And we take it for a greater mercy that we may daily offer this *Representative* Body and Blood, and *Commemorative* Sacramental Sacrifice, than to have broken the real Body of Christ our selves daily, and shed his Blood. But I wonder not that they that can *believe*, or take on them to do it in spite of all *Mens Senses*, can do it also in spite of *Scripture, Reason, and Conscience*.

I confess there is something in what you say, p.7. It would have been *an incentive to munificence in adorning Churches with the richest Gold and pretious Stones, and whatever else that's rare and splendid*; and also to enrich and magnifie the *Priest*, that can instrumentally make God of Bread, and Sacrifice him when he hath done; or set him on the Altar, or keep him in a Box. But to the entertaining of Christ into the heart by Faith and Love, a Representative Sacrifice seemeth more meet for us to exercise: And Christ said to *Thomas*, *blessed are they that have not seen, and have believed*.

Your third Assertion is, that [*The Bread and wine in the holy Eucharist, are by the Omnipotent Power of God actually, and indeed changed into the Body and Blood of our blessed Saviour Je sus Christ*].

Ans.

Ans. This is to the purpose if it be but proved. But, alas, where is the Proof? Why you give us such as you have, and we can expect no better from you. You say [*This was the Universal Belief of the Christian World in the ninth Century.*] How prove you that? Very easily in your own conceit; *ziz.* say you [*It is evident by the Testimony of all the Writings of that Age, and by the Universal Testimony of the tenth Age; nor do our Adversaries deny it.*]

Ans. 1. All these three are false: Neither all the Writings of the ninth Age, nor the Universal Testimony of the tenth, saith it; and your Adversaries do deny it.

2. But was there not some sorry necessity that put you to begin your Proof so low as nine, or ten hundred Years after Christ? Methinks you should have feared, lest this have opened all the deceit.

3. Your Adversaries challenge you to name one Book that ever so much as named Transubstantiation, before one *Stephanus Aduensis* after the Year 1100, which was neither in the ninth, nor tenth Century, and yet you have not done it to this day; and yet go on to talk at this rate. And they challenge you to name one General Council that ever determined for either *Name* or *Thing*, (that the Bread and Wine are changed into the very Body and Blood of Christ, and are no longer true Bread and Wine) before the Council at the *Laterane* in *Rome*, under *Innoc. 3.* Anno, 1215. which sure was neither the ninth, nor tenth Century. Can you give us no earlier proof that ever any Council mentioned it (when Councils are your Religion) and yet deceitfully talk with confidence as you do?

4. But suppose the twelfth Century, or thirteenth, had

been the tenth; let us hear your Inference. You say, [*Then it must necessarily be taught in the first Age by the Apostles, to their first Converts over all the World; and consequently be most certainly true: For it cannot be doubted but that the first Converts did understand what was taught them, believe and esteem it as highly necessary to them and their Children.*] — *Then none can doubt but that they could and would and did teach the very same Doctrine which they so highly esteemed, &c.*

Ans. Thus some over-wise Persons can sit in their Closets, and tell from most real Causes, what, *no doubt*, was done in all Ages of the World: And why can you not as infallibly prophesie from such Causes, what will be done, and so get the reputation of a *wise Man* indeed? As one that would infallibly foretel that his Party should conquer in a certain Battel, because they were Men that loved themselves and their Country, and therefore would not wilfully destroy, or desert both; and therefore would not run away: For they know that more are killed when they flye, than when they stand to it; and if they do not run, the Enemy will, as ordinary Experience sheweth; *ergo* they must needs conquer. But when he was asked why all the same things might not be said of the Enemies, and when he shortly heard, *de facto*, that the Enemy had got the day, his great Argument was unanswerably confuted. But let us come to the tryal.

1. I will better argue from your Medium, against you: The far greatest part of Christians in the World are against Transubstantiation at this day; therefore so were their Fore-fathers, and their Fore-fathers, till you come up to the Apostles.

That it is so at this day requireth no better Proof than to have more knowledge in the state of the World, or
more

more honesty in reporting it than you have. *Pag. 16.* you say [*The whole world formerly, in a manner, Pagan, except a handful of Jews is now become Christian.*] Reader, Is this Man like to tell you what all the Christian World held, in former Ages, from such a Medium as their latter Belief, that can no better tell what the Christian World is? Look over the Globe, or Map of the World, and let this Man tell you which be the Countries that are Christian, and then take the Measure there of their Proportion your self. Or to save you the labour, read any credible Author that reporteth it. *Brierwood* in his *Enquiries*, one of the best, tells us, after the naming of the several Countries of each Religion, that if you divide the Known World into *Thirty Parts*, nineteen are Pagan Idolaters, six are Mahometans, and five are Christians of all sorts: But this Man is not ashamed to say, that, *except a handful of Jews, the whole world in a manner Pagan, is now become Christian.* All the Pagans of *Africa*, and *America*, and *Asia*, and all the *Mahometans* are nothing to him; even five sixth parts of the Known World. And, alas, how little probability is there that the *terra incognita*, the vast unknown Regions, should be Christian: sure if they were governed by the Pope, he would know them. He that can Transubstantiate all the Pagans, and Mahometans on Earth, into Christians; and make Men believe that five parts of six of Mankind are now of a Religion which they partly know not, and partly abhor, may not despair hence to prove Transubstantiation. But how many of this *sixth part* of the World are *Papists*? A Bishop *Bromhall* saith, that about the fifth part of the Christians of the World are *Papists*: Others think about a fourth part, not measuring by the largeness of their Dominions (for few in the King of *Spain's* west-

west-Indies are Christians) but by the Number of Professors. But the most that ever I knew any understanding impartial reckoner allow them, is to be the third part of Christians; comparing them with the *Abasines, Copties, Syrians, Armenians, Gregorians, the Greek-Church, and Muscovites*, and all the *Protestants, &c.* And when the Empire of *Abastia* was greater by many Kingdoms, and the Kingdom of *Nubia* was not revolted, and many great Countries of the *Greek Religion* were not yet turned Mahometans, the Papists were proportionably much less a part than now. And though most of these will say, as we do, that the Bread and Wine are Christ's Flesh & Blood (not which is *in Glory*, but which *was* Sacrificed for us on Earth) yet few, if any, of all these do hold real Transubstantiation. If he say the contrary of them, Travellers, and Authors enow of their own can confute him: (How shamefully they have changed the *Æthiopick* Liturgie, as to their sense, by the altering of one word Bishop *Uller* hath shewed from the true Copies; and by such tricks they can, by a Printer, make all the World Papists: and I would the Pope had no other sort of Subjects to uphold his Monarchy, than such as are so made.)

I appeal now to any impartial reason, whether I may not better argue against Transubstantiation, because two or three parts of the Christian World are against it, than he can argue for it, because a third or fourth part are now for it, or were so in the twelfth, or the tenth Century.

But perhaps he will say, that *they are of the same Religion that they ever were, but so are not the Protestants.* I answer, 1. The Protestants will not undertake that none of their Ancestors from the beginning were in this, or other points, erroneous: If the Papists will, it is suitable to their other undertakings: But that we are of the same
Reli-

Religion which all true Christians were of from the beginning, the *same Baptism*, the *same Creed*, the *same Lords-Prayer* and *Decalogue*, and the *same Scriptures*, owned, shew: and the Lords-Supper Administred in the *same* words as Christ and his Apostles and the ancient Churches did. 2. But if the Protestants had not been of the *same Faith* with their Ancestors, what's that to the rest that are more than all the Papists? It's notable to read in their *Godignus de rebus Abassinorum*, how an old Woman (the Emperors Mother) confuted, or baffled the Learned papist that came with *Oviedo* to pervert them to the Pope, by pleading the Tradition of their Fore-fathers, that had delivered them their Religion, and never told them of the Pope. And how tenacious the *Greeks* are of their Religion as received from their Fathers, their very stiffness against the *Roman* Insertion of [*Filiog*;] into the Creed, sufficiently sheweth. 3. But that really the Papists are Innovators, and have changed the old Religion in this Point, as we have oft fully proved out of Antiquity, so we need no other Proof than the expresse words of Scripture; which (to pass by the rest) in one Chapter in the three next Verses 1 *Cor.* 11. 26, 27, 28.) doth three times call it [*Bread*] after Consecration. And I never met with a Writer so impudent as dare deny but their leaving out the Cup to the Laity in the Lords-Supper is a change from the antient Practice of the Church. And yet will this Medium serve our *Rational Discourser*; *The present Church leaveth out the Cup*, ergo so did *their Fore-fathers*, and so did the Apostles? And let him tell me, with the Face of a Man, if he can, whether he think in his Conscience that our Ancestors, or the first Converts of the Apostles, were not more likely to *understand* and *remember whether the Bread and Cup* were

were both delivered by the Apostles, or the Bread alone, than to *understand* and *remember* in what sense it was that the Bread and Wine was called Christ's *Body* and *Blood*.

In sum, 1. We believe that all true Christians have the same Religion which was first received from the Apostles. 2. We are sure that they kept not all the same Purity, and Integrity of that Religion; As some fell quite away to Paganism, and Mahumatanism, and some to Arrianism, and other Heresies; so some that fell not so far, fell to lesser Errors. 3. And we do undertake to prove, contrary to this Discourser, that the generality of the Churches for many Ages, and the most of the Christian World to this day, held not, and hold not Transubstantiation.

II. I farther use his own Argument against him; At this day, the greatest part of the Church, by far, and in the fourth Century, that which they themselves call the *Universal Church*, denied the *Pope's Primacy* (much more his *Sovereignty*) to be of *Divine Institution*: Therefore so did the first Converts of the Apostles. If the Consequence be good in your Case, it is much more in this. 1. You falsely feign all the Church to have been for Transubstantiation, but I shall undeniably prove what I urge them for, as being against the Divine Institution of the *Roman Primacy*. 2. And this is a Point likelier to be commonly understood and remembred, than the meaning of the words [*Body and Blood*.] I prove the Antecedent.

1. That most Christians now are against it, is a matter of Fact commonly known: Two or three parts of the Christian World being no Subjects of the Pope at all, viz. Those before mentioned. 2. That in the fourth and fifth Century the Church was of this judgment, appeareth

peareth by the most exprefs words of one of the four Great General Councils, even that at Calcedon, which faith, [*Definitiones sanctorum Patrum sequentes ubiq; & Regulam, & que nunc relecta sunt* 150 *Deo amantissimorum Episcoporum, qui Congregati sunt sub pie memorie Imperatore majore Theodosio in Regia Civitate Constantinop. nova Roma, Cognoscentes & nos eadem definivimus de privilegio ejusdem sanctiss. Constantinop. Ecclesie, nova Roma: Etenim sedi senioris Romae, propter Imperium Civitatis illius, Patres consequenter privilegia reddiderunt: & eadem intentione promoti* 150 *Deo amantiss. Episcopi aqua sanctissima sedi nova Roma privilegia tribuerunt, rationaliter judicantes Imperio & senatu urbem ornatam aquis senioris Regia Romae privilegiis frui.*] that is ["We following
 " alway the definitions of the holy Fathers and the Ca-
 " non, and knowing those things which now have been
 " read of the 150 Bishops most beloved of God, that were
 " Congregated under the Emperour, of pious memory,
 " Theodosius, the greater, in the Royal City, Constantino-
 " ple, New Rome, have our selves also defined the same
 " things concerning the Priviledges of the same most ho-
 " ly Church of Constantinople, New Rome: For, to the
 " Seat of Old Rome, because of the Empire of that City,
 " the Fathers consequently gave the Priviledges: And
 " the 150 Bishops most beloved of God, being moved
 " with the same intention, have given equal Priviledges
 " to the most holy Seat of New Rome, reasonably judg-
 " ing that the City, adorned with the Empire and Senate,
 " shall enjoy equal Priviledges with Old Regal Rome.]

Here you see, 1. That two of the four greatest General Councils concur. 2. That they profess herein to follow the old Definitions, and Rule. 3. That they conclude that Romes Priviledges were given it by the Fathers.

D

4. And

43 And that because of the Imperial Seat. 5. And therefore they give equal privileges to *Constantinople*.

The Testimony is such as nothing but impudent violence can put by: either they speak true, or not: If not, then how come two of the greatest General Councils so quickly to falsifie the Tradition of the Apostles? Did they not understand what their Fathers had delivered to them? or did they disesteem it, or forget it?

If they spake truth, (as they did) you see that *Rome* hath no privileges, or primacy, from God's Institution, but (like *Canterbury*) in our Empire by the Princes and Fathers Gift.

Which is so sure, that he must put off common Ingenuity, that considerately will deny it, having not only this Testimony of two Grand Councils, but the continued opinion of all the *Greek-Church*, even before their division from the *Roman*: For, let any Man rationally Answer me this Argument. [*The whole Greek-Church knew that a Divine Institution was to be preferred before a Humane: The whole Greek-Church knew that Constantinople was not by Divine, but by Humane Institution, made Patriarchal or equal with Rome, and yet were for its Patriarchate and equality, if not priority: Therefore the whole Greek-Church judged Romes Patriarchate and Primacy to be of Humane, and not of Divine Institution. I have larglier proved this elsewhere.*

III. I give you another Argument with your own Medium. [*The Universal Church in the time of the Councils of Constance and Basil, judged that a Pope might be a wicked Heretick, and as such be deposed; and that it is de fide, that Councils have power so to do: Ergo, this was the Doctrine of the Apostles to their Converts.*] And yet the Councils at the *Literano* under *Leo the Tenth*, and *Florence*,

rence, determine that the Pope is above a Council. What Self-contradictors now do you make the Apostles to be? How could the Councils of *Basil* and *Constance* believe that Councils are above the Pope, and that he may be a fallible wicked Heretick, unless they had received it down from the Apostles? And how could the Councils at the *Laterane*; and *Florence*, judge the contrary, unless they had received it down from the Apostles? Will neither Reason nor Experience make you ashamed of cheating the World by such filly Inferences?

IV. But yet I will come nearer you: The same General Council at the *Laterane*, *sub Innoc. 1.* which first decreed for the Belief of Transubstantiation, did in the very next Canon and words, decree, That all Temporal Lords should exterminate from their Dominions all such, as Hereticks, that denyed this Transubstantiation; and if they did not exterminate them, should be excommunicate by the Pope; and if yet they did it not, the Pope should depose them,, and absolve their Vassals from their Allegiance, and give their Dominions to another. Now either they had this by Tradition from their Ancestors, and so from the Apostles, or not: If not, why should you dream that the Council had the *second* Canon from the Apostles, and not the *third*? If yea: Then, 1. We see what we must expect from your Religion: The King must exterminate all Protestants (and other Decrees say, *Burn them*) or else be deposed himself. To exterminate us all, will be almost to depose himself. Kind Sir, whither shall we all go? or who shall burn so many? It will be a greater *Incendium* than that of *London*, or *South-wark*: And who shall be the Kings Subjects? Who shall Plant *England* anew? The *French*, *Spaniards*, or *Italians*? But what if in this fortunate Island they also should

awaken and turn Protestants ; must the King be to seek for new Planters to be his Subjects ?

As *Benedictus Spinoza*, who assaulted the Scripture, did at once also assault all Civil Government ; and taught men, that he that could get the Crown had best right to it ; and that a Man may kill any that stand in the way of his desires, and break any Vows when they are against those desires (which are his Interest,) God mercifully so ordering it, that he that will depose Christ, shall with him be permitted to depose all Kings and Governours ; Even so God in mercy to preserve Princes, in their wits, from turning Papists, hath permitted the same Men that first by Council condemned common Sense, and made God the deceiver of Sense, and of the World, and new brought Transubstantiation into the Faith, to make a Decree also (such as never Turks, or Canniballs made) That all Men that will not renounce all their Senses (that is, their animality, and their humanity) shall be exterminated ; and all Princes deposed that will have such (as renounce not humanity) for their Subjects.

Several things are said to this, by Men that think that, if they do but open their Mouths, and speak, though it be to prove that Murder is Mercy and Piety, they have conquered.

1. Say some, *You see the King of France, and others, do not so.* *Ans.* 1. If they may be good Catholics that rebel against the Pope and a General Council, why may not we? 2. I speak not of what any of you do, but what your very Religion bindeth you to do: Are not Councils your objective Religion? By the same Law and Religion then that Transubstantiation was first decreed, if it rule in England, we are all in Law exterminated, or dead Men (except the Papists) or else the King must be no King.

Can

Can you say in Conscience that your Ancestors had this from the Apostles? If you will, let Kings, that love your Tradition, take it.

2. But some say, that these were no Decrees of the Council, because they were but proposed in haste by Pope *Innoc.* and not passed by the Council. This help Bishop *Taylor*, Bishop *Gunning*, and Bishop *Pierſon*, in kindness, would give the Papists; but unthankful Men will not accept it: And therefore the Answerers to Bishop *Gunning* and Bishop *Pierſon* prove the contrary, as Mr. *Dodwell* hath unanswerably done lately at large. And what ever it was in it self, it was a General Council to the Papists, and is part of their Religion, who number it with the approved ones. And *Math. Paris* saith but this, that [many Decrees were proposed, or brought in by the Pope, which some liked, and some disliked] and yet the Major Vote might pass them: See also *Naucler*, *Gen.* 41. an. 1215. *Godefrid ad an.* 1215. *Platin. in Vit. Innoc.* 3.

3. Others say, that these were but Decrees of Practice and Discipline, and not *de fide*; and therefore the Pope is not here Infallible, nor his Council neither. But Men that will not take a sound of Words for their Estates, Lives, and Souls, may soon answer this. 1. That though there be many things to be believed, that are not to be done; yet there is nothing to be done but what we must first believe that it *may*, or *must* be done. When it is said, Thou shalt love God and thy Neighbour; it is included, that, Thou must believe it thy Duty to love God and thy Neighbour: So he that saith [Hereticks shall be exterminated, and Temporal Lords that will not do it shall be deposed, and their Dominions given to others] doth include, that [To do so is a Duty, or Lawful at least.] Sure it is not confessedly decreed that the Pope shall so,

or that Temporal Lords shall be deposed by him for any thing but sin, in their Assertion.

2. If you grant that a Pope and General Council are Fallible about Duty and Sin, even in deposing Princes, and dissolving their Subjects Oaths of fidelity, how shall we know that they are Infallible in matters of Faith? He that is deceived in saying, Thou must obey the Ten Commandments, may be deceived in saying, Thou shalt believe the Creed: If we cannot be sure by the Churches Proposal that *God is to be loved*; how shall we that way be sure that *he is to be believed*, and that *the Scripture is his word*. And if the Pope may excommunicate and depose Princes, and change Dominions by error, how can I be sure that he may not say by error, that this Bread is no Bread, and this Wine is no Wine.

3. Is it only matter of *Faith*, and not matter of *Fact* that you have by sure Tradition? Is not matter of *Fact* (as Christ's Birth, Death, Resurrection, and Ascension) also matter of Faith? And is not this in question a matter of Fact, *viz.* Whether, *de facto*, the Apostles told the first Converts, that Bread after Consecration was no Bread, and that this was the meaning of Christ's words [*This is my Body*] which you assert? And it's matter of *Practice* that Men must receive it in this sense. But if the Council may be deceived in this, and make such Laws for ruining Princes and Nations, which yet they were never taught by their Fore-fathers, why may not the same Men say [*Bread is no Bread*] without being taught it by their Fore-fathers.

4. Will you give it us under your hand, that this Council and Pope did err in this, and are not to be obeyed, that Princes may have so much notice of your trustfulness? But what Council hath ever since declared that this

this Pope and Council erred in this, name it me if you can? No, they will be guilty of no such Contradictions as shall signifie repentance and amendment.

5. In the mean time, is not the Pope and his Council by this Decree, *declared Enemies* to all Protestant Princes, and People? What can any proclaimed Hostility do more, than thus by your highest power to Decree Extermination of all the People, and Deposition of their Lords? And is not he to be taken and used as a Publick Professed Enemy, who so professeth himself? Are you not all virtually in continual Arms against us, who make the Decrees of such Councils your Religion?

V. And why might not an *Arrian* have argued as you do, when they had their General Councils, and the *World* groaned to find it self turned *Arrian*, saith a Father? Might they not at *Ariminum* and *Firmium* have said, *How can we believe it, unless our Fathers had it from the Apostles?* And I suppose you know (else *Sondinus* will tell you) that the *Arrians* pretend as confidently to *Tradition* as the Papists do. And your own *Dionys. Petavius* hath cited so great a Number of the antientest Fathers and Writers, who speak words too plainly favouring of, or favouring *Arrianism*, as will tell any Man that their pretense is not without such a colour of proof, as is as plausible as any you can bring for the Tradition of Transubstantiation at the least.

VI. I pray you tell us which way was Transubstantiation delivered down from the Apostles? By *writing*, or *without-book, by word alone*? If by *writing*, are not those *writings* yet extant? And cannot we read them as well as you? You tell us that all the Writings of the ninth, or tenth Age shew it (which is false.) But if the Writings of the first eight hundred years shewed not the same

same thing to them, how did they know it? If by bare words, can you make your self believe that bare words, and Memory, will as surely convey down from Age to Age, the Myſteries of Faith, as *Written Records* will do? Do you not daily find, that if Men are but to repeat a Sermon, yea a few *Sentences*, how apt they are to alter, or omit, or add some words which alter the whole ſenſe? I ſeldom hear a Sermon reported, but ſomewhat of it is miſ-reported! yea, we can ſcarce have a matter of Fact reported without great diverſity and miſ-reports; which makes the common reports of Perſons, and Things, in City and Country, to be ſo full of falſhood, and uncertainty. Mens Memories are ſlippery, and the alteration of a word, may make the matter another thing. Send but your Servant to do a meſſage, or buſineſs for you, by bare word and memory; and at another time Write him down all that he ſhall ſay, or do; and try which way will occaſion more miſtake! Why do you keep your Bonds, Bills, Covenants, Leaſes, Deeds, and Teſtaments in Writing elſe, and do not truſt them to Mens Memories? Why are our Laws Written, and Court Records kept, if Memory will keep them better? Had we no Books, or Records, one Lawyer would ſay one thing, and another, another thing, and there would be nothing but uncertainty and confuſion. Why do ſo many Preachers uſe Sermon Notes? Why do you cauſe all your Maſs, even the *Hoc eſt Corpus meum* to be read out of a Book, and truſt not your Maſs-Prieſts to repeat them by Memory? Beſides, that Men Write more deliberately, and accurately, than uſually they ſpeak, and their ſenſe is eaſier tried, and reviewed. Where Mens Life and Death lyeth on it, Phyſicians will hardly truſt their Memories with all their Remedies, nor ſend one to the Apothecaries without
a writ

a written Bill, lest the mistake of a word, or Dose, prove Death.

VII. And I ask you farther, Is all the rest of your Religion delivered only, or most certainly, by word of Mouth and Memory, or rather by Books? Are not the Decrees of all your approved General Councils for Faith and Practice your Religion? And are not these written in Books? Have Caranza, Crab, Surius, Nicolinus, Binius, the great and many Volumns of the French Edition, and all the rest, been all written in vain? Do all your Lay-Papists, or all your Priests, or any of them carry all these in their Memories to a word? Or are they there as sure as in your Books? Doth Verbal Tradition now deliver down your Religion? Nay, do you not Write your very Confessions and Creeds? If all your Books were burnt, would not your Religion be greatly changed, while much of the Decrees of Councils would be forgotten? and O what contention and confusion about them would there be?

VIII. But if all your Religion was so currantly delivered by word of Mouth by Fathers to their Children, what made the ancient Doctors pass by the same things in their Writings? when their Writings were purposely to tell their Readers what was the Christian Religion, and the reasons of it; would they leave out that in their deliberate Writings, which every Child was taught by his Parents?

IX. But what mean you to talk of all Parents delivering it to their Children? Do you mean all Priests, or all Lay-men? If Priests had Children, it's like they were Married; And had you then the Celibate of Priests by Tradition from the Apostles? If you mean Lay-men, would you make Men believe any Story you tell them, contrary to the experience of their daily Converse? Do we not see

E

that

that the far greatest part of Men, both among Papists, Greeks, and Protestants, have too little sense, or understanding of Religion, to be accurate keepers of the sense of Scripture? Try your own followers in *Ireland, Spain, Italy*, yea, or *France*, whether the generality of the Common People teach their Children, or understand themselves, what a Sacrament is; though your Industry may teach them to Cant out such words as you would have them say in opposition to the Protestants. When we have much ado to get most of the Vulgar to endure to be Catechised themselves, and to understand the very Creed, and Principles of Christianity; do you suppose them competent preservers of the mysterious sense of such words as we are Controverting?

X. And if Tradition without Writing be so sure, how cometh Tradition to be so contrary? The Millenaries pretended to Tradition from *St. John*? Most of the Writers of the first 300 Years seem for them. Yet I think you will scarce confess that this was indeed the Doctrine of any Apostles.

XI. How long did the Opinion and Practice of Infants Communion prevail in the Church? Doth it follow therefore that they had it from the Apostles? Why then do you disuse it?

XII. The Practice of not adoring, kneeling on any Lords-day in the Year, or any Week-day between *Easter* and *Whitsontide*, was indeed called the Practice of the Universal Church, and an Apostolical Tradition; and was Decreed in the first General Council at *Nice, Can. 20*. If they had not this from the Apostles, how prove you that your Transubstantiation is from them? If they had; why have you changed an Apostolical Universal Practice?

XIII. And

XIII. And if it was the Common Belief of the Church, why did never General Council mention it till 1215 Years after Christ's Birth? Was it because it was commonly known? So were the Articles of Faith which they do mention: And sure it is the Common Faith which they are to preserve and deliver. Unless they were negligent or forgetful, it was because no such thing was then believed.

XIV. The ancient Churches professed that their Creed contained all the necessary Articles of the Christian Faith: And when Hereticks obscured some of them, they put the Exposition of them into their after Creeds. If Transubstantiation then was a necessary Article of Faith, how came it to be left out of all the Creeds?

XV. The second Council at *Nice* held Angels to be Corporeal, and that Images were not to be worshipped with *Latria*: Yet *Aquinas*, and many others of you, as to the *Image of Christ* and the *Cross*, dissent from them in the latter; and the generality in the former: Had they these then from the Apostles, or not?

XVI. Doth one of your General Councils, (*e.g.* that at *Trent*,) signifie all the Christian World? 1. When they are oft but a few Men (not fifty sometimes) and when one County or Diocess with us hath more Learned Men. 2. When they are a Faction packt by the Pope, and his Agents. 3. When we know that it is usually the Pope, Prince, or Arch-Bishop, or Men of Power, that chuse the Members, though most of the Clergy be oft for others, or have no choice. 4. When all the Papists that send to your Councils are not past the third part of Christians, and the far greatest part have no Delegates there. 5. When we know that a few Mens Interest, and Speeches in such Assemblies use to carry away the most.

most. 6. When we know that they use to differ among themselves, and sometime carry a Cause but by a few Votes : And how shall we be sure that if ninety say one thing, and one hundred say the contrary, that the ninety did not as well understand the Tradition of their Forefathers as the hundred? 7. And when we know that Men are oft in Council born down by fears, or hopes, or fair words, and repent when they come home, as the *Greeks* did after the Council at *Florence*. 8. Yea, when we know that they sometime fall into inhumane Fewds, yea, and fight it out to Blood, as the Case of *Dioscorus* against *Flavianus* proveth. And is this a certain Tradition of what was delivered by the Apostles?

Indeed Baptism, the Creed, Lords-Prayer, Decalogue, and the Eucharist have been delivered down by certain Tradition; But so hath not every Controversie about them; nor in particular, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

XVII. Read but *Pet. Molinæus de Novitate Papismi*, or but the *Non-conformists* late *Morning Lectures* on that Point; and you will see how the Papists have innovated in Religion, and all their Errours proved *Novelties*: And shall we think that such *changers* have kept Transubstantiation as from the Apostles, that could not keep one half the Sacrament it self which they delivered them?

XVIII. How shall the ignorant know whether this Man say true? that most Books, and most Men were for Transubstantiation in the ninth and tenth Centuries? The time is past, and the Men are dead: Must he know it by the Books of those Ages, or by the Testimony of this Age? If by their Books, 1. How shall he that hath read their *Index expurgatorius*, and known their corrupting of Authors, be sure that those are not corrupted? or
many

many of them as very Forgeries, as *Mercators Decretals*, and abundance of Spurious Writings? To proved by *Cook, Blondell, Rives, Usher*, and many more. Is it necessary to Salvation that the Vulgar (yea, or the Priests) have so much skill in History as to know which way most Men went for so many Ages past, in the Exposition of such a Text of Scripture? What Man can tell now what mind most of the World are of in several Mysteries, and Controversies between you and us? Who can tell how to take their Votes? Much less can every illiterate Man know what mind most Men were of in former Ages; and least of all to be able critically to judge of the Evidence, and what Authors are spurious and corrupted; and what sound. 2. Nay, who ever put so much Cosmography into the Creed before you, or made it necessary to Salvation, to know that there is such a Place as *Rome* in the World? 3. If Books must decide that Case for the ninth and tenth Century, why not for the former also? And have not we all those Books as well as you? And yet we are confident that they are against you. 4. But if it must be by the Testimony of the present Generation, whose Testimony must it be that must tell us what our Fore-Fathers held? Must it be by the Testimony of a Council? 1. There is no General to enquire of, nor hath been long; nor know we whether ever there will be? 2. If it must be by the *last Council*, 1. How shall the Vulgar know that it was a true General Council, any more than that of *Ephes*. 2. *Basil, Constance, &c.* 2. How know they what they did Decree? They never saw, or heard them. If it must be by the Printed Books, 1. They cannot read them. 2. They know not whether they are forged, or falsified. 3. They know not the meaning of them. If it must be by

Re-

Reports, by *whose* Report? Father *Paul Servita* maketh them a pack of Fellows that abuse the World, under the shew of a General Council: He was a Papist. We cannot look for another Council to tell us what *this* Council said. Must men take the word of *particular men*? Some accuse that Council, some own it: Whom shall we believe? must it be every *single Priest*? Then Father *Paul* must be believed against them: And some that turn from the Pope say more against them than he: And how shall the People know that the Priest saith true? Perhaps he knoweth the Priest to be a common Liar, or perjured; at least, he knoweth him not to be infallible. If the *Pope* be infallible, none of you saith that *each Priest* is so: And we never saw or heard the Pope. If you say that we must believe the Priests where they all consent: How shall ordinary men know that, who never see a Council, nor *many* of them? If the major Vote must be believed: who shall gather the Votes, and how shall the People know them? In a word, I see no way that you have to give men any assurance what to believe to salvation, (for the generality that cannot travel over the World, nor get skill in History and Cosmography) but only to believe that Priest that speaketh to him, when perhaps he knoweth him to be a man that hath forfeited belief; or at least is neither the Pope, Council, Church, nor pretendeth to infallibility.

But suppose that the person be so learned, as to be versed in the Councils, How shall he know by them what the former Ages held? 1. What Councils be they that he must believe, and how shall he be sure of it? Is it the Councils aforesaid of *Ephes.* 2. *Basil*, *Constance*, and such other? These you reject, and many more. 2. Do any Councils tell him by Decrees, which former Councils were

were currant; and which not? Sure they do not; no, not the last at *Trent*: So that it is not, *de fide*, with your selves, which are the true Councils, and which not.

3. How doth a later Council know which former Councils were true? Not because they find so themselves; for then all would be true: If it be by any Characters, what be they, and why may we not know them? 4. How do Councils know which way most Writers went, or what they wrote? As it cannot be expected that the Bishops that met at *Trent* should remember by Tradition what all the Christians in the world *said or thought* in every Age; so neither were all *Writers words* known to them without Book, by verbal Tradition. I pray you tell me truly, whether ever any General Council took that way to prove what *Justin, Tertullian, Cyprian, Basil, Gregories, Hierom, Augustine, Chrysostom, &c.* said and held, by shewing that they had it by Tradition from other Councils Decrees, or their Fathers telling them so, rather than by looking into the Writings of the Authors themselves? And your own Doctors commonly tell us *what the Fathers held*, by citing the *Fathers words*, and not by telling us, that either Councils, or their Fathers, or Mothers, or Nurses told them what they said or held, [except in the common Essentials of Christianity, the Sacramental Covenant, Creed, Lords-Prayer, Decalogue, and that the Scripture is Gods Word] which all Christians acknowledge are delivered to us, as by two hands, *viz.* by verbal and practical Tradition; and by the Scripture it self.

But if it be the *Present Church* real, (that is, the consent of Christians) which must tell us what was held in the former Ages (which for ought I find is it that you flye to;) though the ignorant cannot try this, all know-
ing

ing men can tell that this way you are utterly condemn-
ed: For at this day, as is said before, at least two third
parts of the Christian World are against your very Pa-
pacy it self; and believe the ancient Churches to have
been against it: So that Tradition doth depose the Pope.
So that you have no way left, but to say, *It is our own
judgment or Tradition alone that we will stand to.*

So much to your dull cheat, about your pretended
Universal Tradition.

Pag. 11. You notably say, [*Suppose a Book fully written
as to all points to be believed by Christians, by the first
Teachers of Christianity: Let them together with this Book
give charge to their first Converts, not to add to it, or di-
minish it, and to believe as in their Consciences they shall
think that Book shall teach them. Though Generation af-
ter Generation be never so faithful to such a Charge, yet
they may in after Ages come to lose or change their Faith,
because the Book may seem to one Generation to bear one
sense, and to another Generation to bear another----* As
these words, *This is my Body, may seem to one Age to bear
this sense, This is the Sign of my Body, &c.*]

1. But you must suppose also, that they that will learn
this Book must have Teachers: Else how will they so
much as read it? We are for Teachers as well as you,
though not for Judges that may judge *in partem utramli-
bet*. The Pastors may teach the People that there is a
God, a Christ, a Life to come; but cannot judge that
there is *none*. And Teachers make known that same Evi-
dence of Truth to the Learner, by which they received it
themselves; but do not say, you must believe that there
is a God, a Christ, a Heaven, meerly because we say so.

2. And you must put into your Supposition, that (as
is said) the *Essentials* are delivered both ways, by *wri-
ting* and by *word of mouth*.
3. And

3. And now suppose, that the Apostles had put the same expository words of [*This is my Body*] into a *Book*, which they spake by word of mouth? Had that been the less *intelligible* because they were in the Book? Or the harder to be remembred? Or could that Age have delivered to the next any more, as from the Apostles, than what they received? And if that be the same written as spoken, sure writing maketh it not the less or worse? If it do, all your Religion is in danger, now it is written in your Volumns of Councils. Have you *more* yet thats necessary, besides all those Volumns, which you whisper or deliver by word of mouth? If not, you profess your Religion unsafe, because you have written it.

4. And indeed you here profess, that the fidelity of successive Generation cannot preserve Religion, by preserving and delivering any Books. And if so, then your preservation of Fathers, and written Councils, and Decretals, is no sufficient Tradition of the sense of [*This is my Body*]. Could you shew us your sense in them, it is an insufficient Tradition; for one may take your Councils in one sense, and another in another.

5. But do you indeed think that any Person or Country is secured from changing their Religion by your verbal way? Why then did the Reformers when they were of your way forsake it? Why did the *Greek Churches* disown you? Nay, why did so many ancient Churches apostatize to Mahometanism? Was it for want of Verbal Tradition? Had they not the same as you? Sure no Law will secure it self from being broken by sinners, and no Tradition is enough to prevent Apostasie. But why the same words should be less sufficient *written* by the Apostles, than *spoken* by them; or why Gods Writings should not be as sure and clear in things of necessity, as your

Councils; or why your Councils should be insufficient, because written, no impartial man can tell.

But you say further, [*But no ten Families who have been taught by their Parents, either to believe that our Saviours Body is in the Eucharist, or that it is not there, (you should have said, in what sense it is there) can possibly mistake, &c.*]

Dreams may seem something to men that are asleep: If God had written the same words that my Mother spake to me, why could not I have as well understood them? Doth my Mother, or Father, or Priest speak so much more wisely than God? Sure not, if the words were the same. But alas, can you keep us from knowing, that you and we have ten thousand and ten thousand Families near together, where the Parents never talk much to their Children about any such matters, nor catechize them, nor themselves understand them: When we ask many of the ignorant Papists, whether they believe that there is no true *Bread and Wine* at all after consecration, they tell us that they do hold that there is, though yet Christs Body and Blood be there, which is but the *Lutherans* Consubstantiation: And do you not know what *Durandus* taught in this? and yet they that chide him excuse him from Heresie. And had *Durandus* never heard what ten Parents teach their Children?

You presently stab your Papacy to the heart, when you say [*Seeing God Almighty is resolved not to teach every Age by immediate infallible Missionants from himself, but to send inspired Ambassadors to one particular generation only, and to leave that generation to teach their Children successively till the day of judgement, what they learnt, &c.* Thus much is just the Protestant Religion. But then what's become of the inspired Infallibility of your Church? who thought

though they understood not the matter when they came to the Council, (or though the Pope were an unlearned Lad) yet presently can infallibly expound *Scripture*, and decide Controversies. As you praise Mr. *Thorndike*, you might have accepted of the kindness of one Mr. *Warley* of *Cambridge*, in a Book lately dedicated to the Lord Chancellor, called, *The Natural Fanatick*, who will allow the Church and Councils a higher way of certain determination, than by *Reason*; and will tell you how doubtful its left to Reason, whether there be a *God*, or the *Soul be immortal*, and will curb men that will set their Reason against Councils or the Church. But to remember and rehearse only the words that the Apostles delivered, is a work that Reason may perform, without any inspired *infallibility*.

But if Tradition by immediate Parents, yea and Pastors be so sure, the *Abassines*, the *Greeks*, and many others, are sure that the Papacy is an Usurpation: And so were the old *Britains*, and the *Scots*, a little before *Beda's* time, who would neither conform to the Church of *Rome*, nor so much as eat with them.

Pag. 42. You say [*If God Almighty will oblige me to believe what was taught 1600 years before I was born, how should he expect I should come to the knowledge of this, but by such Books as were written in those times, and near those times, and by the testimony of all Christian Countries, what hath been immemorially believed by them, ever since they were Christians.*]

Ans. Well contradicted: This is our very Religion: We stand to *Vincent. Larniens. Rule, Quod semper, ubique, ab omnibus*. But, 1. Here then Books be not made so unserviceable as before. 2. God Almighty obligeth us first to believe his *own Book* before any *others*: And

how shall we more certainly know what Christ did and commanded, than by those that purposely Wrote so many Gospels, or Histories of it, that we might believe and have Life by his Name. Sure the four Evangelists and the Apostles Wrote what they Wrote (even to the ignorant) to be understood and read. 3. We also know by the Books written near *those times* what then was received by the Churches. And your Councils cannot know it (nor your Pope neither) by any other means than are known to others: for their extraordinary Inspiration we never saw cause to believe. 4. And I remember no one thing at all, which I do not receive, *which hath the Testimony of all Christian Countries that it hath immemorially been believed by them ever since they were Christians*; nor shall I reject such when you prove it. But that is, because, *de facto*, I think there is no error that hath such a kind of Testimony; and not because I think it *impossible*: For as your part of the World is deceived, *e.g.* to think that the *Roman Supremacy* was instituted by God, contrary to the judgment of all the *Greek Church*, and of the two forementioned General Councils at *Constantinople* and *Calcedon*; so I know not but it had been possible to have brought all Countries to the same deceit, or to have believed that Christ's Blood might be denied the People in the Sacrament, as a thing received by Tradition.

We believe that the true Church infallibly believeth what ever it believeth upon true Divine Revelation, and that it can never fall from the Essentials of Christianity; that is, that Christ will still have a true Church in the World till the end. But we know that in many things we offend all, and if every Mans *will* and *Life* is imperfect and culpable, then so is every Mans judgment;
and

and there is no Man living without many errours, who hath the Exercife of Reason ; and the Church is Compofed of fuch erring Individuals : And why it is not poffible for them all to have thought that fome of their errours came down from the Apoftles (as the *Millinaries* thought) I cannot tell. But whatever is truly proved to be delivered by the Apoftles as the Will of Chrift, by *writing*, or *word*, we will readily receive : And the Effentials of Chriftianity we believe, and can prove to have been both ways fo delivered ; and fome things more, (as the Lords-day, &c).

But you fay, pag. 15. "*Can any imagine that they who expofed their Lives for their Religion, would, if they could, agree together, fo notoriously to change it, as to make themfelves moft grofs Idolaters, by adoring Bread and Wine, as the true Body and Blood of their Creator, and God?]* *Anfw.* No, but we may well imagine that good Fathers may have bad Children, and that Children are not born with a Church-hiftory, or Councils written in their minds ; and that worldly Clergymen may deceive, and be deceived ; and that even pious Men might concur in the deceit : that is, That the name of *Chrift's Body and Blood* being juftly from the beginning applyed to the Eucharift, as the Clergy grew formal, ceremonious, selfish, and worldly, they neglected the explication of the fenfe and fpiritual part of the Sacrament ; and grew to over-magnifie the external figns in a way that tended to that advantage and honour to themfelves, which for want of Learning and Grace they could not by their worth attain : That the ninth and tenth Ages which you chufe for inftance were as a Night of darknefs, having few Learned Men, in which he that was but skilled in *Greek* and *Hebrew* was taken for

for a Conjurer, or a Heretick, other of your own Writers besides *Bellarmino* do acquaint you. That the Popes were some Boys, many Murderers, Simoniſts, and moſt horrid, wicked, and ignorant Men, many by one Woman brought in, and poiſoned after; and that for forty Years there were divers Popes at once contending for their ſeveral Titles, almoſt all Hiſtories agree; That hence the World was filled with Treasons, Rebellions, Perjuries, and all wickedneſs, how many Hiſtorians teſtifie; when the Pope hath been judged by a Council for a Heretick, and Adulterer, deſlowering Women at his Doors. And is it incredible that ſuch Men ſhould degenerate from their Fore-fathers? Or ſhall a Fryar now come out of a Cell, and tell the World, that becauſe, the firſt Biſhops of *Rome* were holy Martyrs, it was not poſſible for Pope *John* to be ſuch a blaſphemous filthy Villain; nor for Pope *Eugenius* to be damned as a Heretick and wicked Man by a General Council, and yet continue Pope after depoſition: or for *Sergius* to uſe *Formoſus* as he did? I ſpeak not of rarities, or doubtful things: The Popes greateſt flatterers lament them. *Baronius* ad an. 912 ſaith [“*what*
“*then was the Face of the holy Roman Church? How ex-*
“*ceeding filthy, when the moſt potent, and yet the moſt for-*
“*did whores did Rule at Rome? by whoſe pleaſure Sees*
“*were changed, Biſhops were given, and which is a thing*
“*horrid to be heard, and not to be ſpoken, their Lovers*
“*(or Mates) were thruſt into Peter's Chair, being falſe*
“*Popes, who are not to be writtē in the Catalogue of the*
“*Roman Popes, but only for the marking out of ſuch*
“*times: And what kind of Cardinals, Priests and Deacons*
“*think you we muſt imagine theſe Monſters did chuſe,*
“*when nothing is ſo rooted in Nature, as for every thing*
“*to beget his like?*”] Is not here a Succeſſion fit to prove
the

the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church? O happy Succession! 2. And is it impossible that such Men as these should err? and such Bishops, Priests, and Deacons should change one word that was delivered orally from their Fathers? Is not here a sure Foundation for a Man to build his Faith and Salvation on?

Genebrard another furious Papist (*li. 4. sect. 10.*) saith
 [“ *In this one thing this Age was unhappy, that for near
 “ an hundred and fifty Years, about fifty Popes did wholly
 “ fall away from the vertue of their Ancestors, being ra-
 “ ther irregular and Apostatical, than Apostolical.*”] Apo-
 states make an Apostolical Succession of Infallible wicked Men. Reader, did not our *Rational Discourser* wisely chuse the ninth and tenth Ages for his ground-work? These are the very Ages whose Testimony he appealeth to.

Pope *Adrian* (after) himself, (*de Sacram. Confirm. Art. 4.* saith, that there have many Popes of *Rome* been Hereticks. And as I said, Pope *John 13* alias *12* was in Council Convict of Ravishing Maids, Wives, and Widdows, at the Apostolick Doors, and of committing many Murders, and he drank a health to the Devil; and at Dice called for help to Jupiter and Venus, and at last was killed in the Act of Adultery.

Saith their *Platina* [He was from his Youth a Man contaminated with all dishonesty, and filthiness; and if he had any time to spare from his Lusts, he spent it in hunting, and not in praying. — He saith, he was a most wicked man, or rather a Monster. — And saith, [that the Life of this wicked Man being judged in a Council of Italian Bishops, for fear of them he fled, and lived like a wild Beast in the woods.]

Pope *John 23* was accused and deposed by the General Council at *Constance*, upon about seventy Articles, which

which you may see in *Binnius* in about thirteen Columns; viz. of Murders, Adulteries, Witchcraft, Simony, a Heretick, obstinately maintained that there is no Life after this; called commonly, *The Devil incarnate*; said the Soul was extinct with the Body, as a Beasts; denyed the Resurrection, &c. And for these the Council deposed him.

So the great Council at *Basil* deposed *Eugenius* the 4th as [a Rebel against the holy Canons, a notorious disturber and scandalizer of the Peace and Unity of the Church; a Simonist; a perjured wretch; incorrigible; a Schismatick, and an obstinate Heretick] Yet is their Churches Succession continued from this condemned Heretick, who staid in spite of the Council that deposed him.

But you'll say, Though the Pope may so erre, yet General Councils cannot. *Answ.* These very Councils that condemned him, are now rejected by you, as is *Ephes.* 2. and many others: yea accused as being another Church; saith the Learned Cardinal *Cajetan* in his Oration at the Council at the *Laterane* sub. *Leon.* 10. (*Bin. p.* 552.) [*This Novelty of Pisa* (Mark Councils are Novelists) sprung up at *Constance*, and vanished: At *Basil* it sprung up again, and is exploded. And if you be Men it will now also be repressed as it was under *Eugen.* 4. for it cometh not from Heaven, nor doth it embrace the Principality of that One who is in the Church-Triumphant, and preserveth the Church-Militant; and which the Synod of *Pisa* ought to embrace if it came from Heaven, and not as it doth to rely on the Government of a Multitude. The Church of the *Pisans* therefore doth far differ from this Church of Christ: For one is the Church of Believers, the other of Cavillers; One of the Household of God, the other of the Erroneous: One of Christian-men, the other of such

as

as fear not to tear the Coat of Christ; and divide the Mystical Members of Christ from his Mystical Body.

See here to what Novelty and Apostacy, even to be another Church: You think that General Councils have fallen, as those Councils say the Pope hath done. O but *these Men* can corrupt nothing, because the Martyrs would not have corrupted it! And yet even good Mens pious credulity, believing ignorant Mens Dreams and Visions (such as *Gregories* Dialogues and *Beda* shew to any rational Man) may do much to introduce Changes.

But if Changes be so impossible, because Fore-fathers were pious Men and of another mind, how come the *Greek-Churches* to be Apostatized so far to Mahometanism? and why do you accuse the Protestants, or *Greeks* of changing, if it was impossible (for ten Families) to do it? Sure then the *Abassines, Syrians, Armenians, Greeks, &c.* have their old Faith still unchanged, if it be impossible. Sure never such Villany was charged on their Bishops as on your Popes. If they may change, notwithstanding their Fore-fathers Piety, why not you?

In the last place I should speak to your Testimonies out of some Ancients. But 1. Why should we put it to the tryal of Fathers, when you dare not stand to it, but fly to the Authority and Judgment of your present Church; that is, your Pope. 2. Can any Fathers speak plainer than *St. Paul* himself doth, who calleth it *Bread* after Consecration thrice in the three next Verses? Or did the Fathers contradict him? If they delivered what they received, we see what that was. Is oral Tradition contrary to the Scripture? Is not this a certain Argument? *Paul* in *1 Cor. 11.* saith oft that it is *Bread* after Consecration; ergo, that Speaker, or Writer is deceived, or a

Deceiver, who saith, that he or any other Apostle delivered the contrary by word of Mouth.

3. Doth this Discourser mean sincerely in talking of Tradition and the Fathers Testimonies, and yet never once attempt any answer to all those Testimonies to the contrary, out of their plain words, which our Writers have copiously and often cited. How many, and many more, plain Testimonies of the Fathers against Transubstantiation doth one *Edmundus Albertinus* give you? to which, instead of answers, a few meer words, or cavils are returned: But all these are overlooked by this Discourser.

But come, let us briefly try all his great proof of the Tradition of the Fathers.

1. He begins with excellent *Augustine* (who in a *Carthage* Council did help to quell the Pope's Usurpation). And out of many great Volumes he hath found, 1. That *Austin* said, that [*now it is no longer called Bread, but the Body of Christ*:] The same will the Presbyterians say: Do they not in their Directory say, [*Take, eat, this is the Body of Christ*] when they deliver the Sacrament? Are they therefore for Transubstantiation? Is it all one to say, [*It is not called Bread, and, It is not Bread?*] If the *King's Statue* be made in *Marble* or *Brass*, you may well say, This is not now to be called *Marble* and *Brass*, but the *King*.

2. That *Austin* said [*that Christ gave us his very Flesh to be eaten to our Salvation; but no body eateth that Flesh, unless he have first adored it.*] *Ans.* Any Protestant will say the same. For Christ himself hath said, *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you.* Do not your own sacrilegious Popes and Clergy expound this of something else than the Eucharist? when they deny the *Cup* to the People? If it
be

be that *wine* Consecrated that is here meant, what bloody wretches are you to damn all your Peoples Souls, by denying them all that Blood of Christ, without drinking which they *have no life*? But it's certain by 1 *Cor.* 15. that Christ hath not Flesh and Blood in Heaven, and therefore it is not the Heavenly Body, that, as such, is here meant; but the true sense of Christ and *Austin* is, that as the Sacrifices are eaten by such, by, and for whom they are offered; so his Flesh and Blood offered on the Cross is the true Sacrifice for Sin, which must be eaten in its Commemorative Representation orally in the Sacrament, and really in it self by Faith, that the benefits of that Sacrifice may be ours. And who doth not adore that Christ whom we thus eat and live upon? This is the sum of all that the Fathers say.

But let the Reader judge of *Austin's* mind by plainer words, *De Doctr. Christ.* cap. 7. [*Let no Man look to what they are (mentioning the Bread and wine) but to what they signifie: For our Lord was pleased to say, This is my Body when he gave the sign of his Body.*]

And *Cont. Max.* l. 3. cap. 22. [*We note in the Sacraments, not what they are, but what they shew: For they are signs, which are one thing, and signifie another.*]

And *Epist.* 23. ad *Bonif.* [*If Sacraments had not some likeness (or resemblance) to those things whereof they are Sacraments, they could not be Sacraments at all. From this likeness (or resemblance) they often take the names of what they represent: Therefore as the Sacrament of Christ's Body is in some sort his Body, so the Sacrament of Faith is Faith also.*]

You need no more than this of *Austin* to Interpret other Fathers, that call the Sacrament *Christ's Body*.

II. His next is *Ambrose*, who saith that [*That when Con-*
secration

secration hath been made of Bread, it is made the Flesh of Christ] and [Christ makes this Sacrament] and [the Body of Christ was not before Consecration, but after, &c.]

Ans. 1. All this the Presbyterians say. Even as we say, It is not a Law till the King give the fiat, or it is not his Coin till his Authority and Stamp so make it; And are they therefore of your mind? 2. Ambrose expressly expounds his negation of ordinary Bread; no doubt it is not ordinary Bread. 3. You would deceive the Reader by hiding Ambrose, who saith there, *de Sacram. l. 4. c. 4.* [This we assert, how that which is Bread (mark that) can yet be the Body of Christ] — [And if Christ's Speech had so much that it made that to begin to be which was not; how much more is it operative that the things that were, both Be, and be changed into something else —] And [As thou hast drunk the similitude of Death, so thou drinkest the similitude of precious Blood.] So Ambrose, and so the Protestants.

III. His next is Hierome; out of many Volumns he hath gathered thus much, that Priests [make the Body of Christ with their sacred Mouth and Prayers.] Ans. And any Protestant will say the like: He that saith [This is the Body of Christ] that is, Sacramentally, will say that, under Christ, his Minister maketh it such. And is this the Tradition?

2. Let Hierome speak for himself, *Contr. Jovin. l. 2.* [The Lord as a Type (or Figure) of his Blood, offered not water, but wine.] Are not these words plain, till the Pope expound them?

IV. His next is Cyprian, *de Cæna Dom.* And, 1. Let the Reader note, that even Bellarmine *de script. Eccl. in Cyprian* saith, that the Book which this Man citeth as St. Cyprians, [was neither Cyprians, nor any Learned Mans; and

and had neither words nor sentences worthy a Learned Man, but foolish and ridiculous Narations, and Fables.]

2. The words cited out of it are [*Panis iste quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus est Caro*] But by [*Natura*] the Author plainly meaneth [*the Relative Nature*] and not the Substance. And it was not for nothing that Bellarmine contemneth him, who ever he was; for he is downright against Transubstantiation. Cap 2. He maketh the difference between this and common Meat to be, that, *Corporalis substantia retinens speciem, sed virtutis divinæ invisibili efficientia probans ad esse presentiam*: It is but the presence of Divine Virtue that he affirms to be with the Species of corporeal substance. And plainer, cap. 3. [*when the Lord had said, Do this in my remembrance, This is my Body, and this my Blood*] as oft as by these words and this faith it is done, that *super substantial Bread and Cup*, by solemn blessing hallowed, profiteth to the life and health of the whole Man; being both a Medicine and a Sacrifice, to heal our infirmities and purge our iniquities. And shewing the difference between the Common part of Christ's last Supper, and this Spiritual Food, he addeth, that, [*when the perfidious mind of Judas touched this holy Meat, and the sanctified Bread entred his wicked Mouth, &c.*] So that he calleth it *sanctified Bread* after the Consecration.

And Cap.---- telling why Christ calleth the same both Bread, Blood, Flesh, and his Body, he saith, [*Panis est esca, &c. Bread is Meate, Blood is Life, Flesh is Substance, his Body the Church*. And cap. 4. This Sacrament Christ calleth sometime his Body, sometime Flesh and Blood, sometime Bread; a Portion of Life eternally, which he Communicateth according to these visible things to corporal Nature.

That

That common Bread being turned into Flesh and Blood, procureth Life and increase to bodies (that is, our common Concoction turneth common Bread into our Flesh and Blood ;) Therefore the Infirmitie of our Faith being helped by the usual effect of things, by a sensible Argument is taught, that the effect of Life eternal is in Visible Sacraments ; and that we are united to Christ, non tam Corporaliquam spiritali transitione, not so much by a Corporal as by a Spiritual Transition. And cap. 6. His Conjunction and ours neither mingleteth Person, nor uniteth Substances ; but Consociateth Affections, and Confederateth Wills.

And the same Author, or another, in Cyprian's Works, de Unctione Chrysm. cap. 7. Saith [Our Lord at the Table where he last feasted with his Disciples, gave them with his own hands Bread and Wine ; but on the Cross he gave his Body to be wounded by the hands of Souldiers, that the sincere truth, and true sincerity, secretly imprinted in the Apostles, might expound to the Nations how the wine and Bread was Flesh and Blood ; and by what Reasons the Causes agreed to the Effects, and divers Names and Species were reduced to one Essence ; and the Things signifying, and the things signified were called by the same Names, (or known by the same Words) By these Priviledges of supernatural Grace, by the eating of sanctified Bread, being refreshed, washed, and anointed, &c.] Reader, here you see what Tradition saith.

Next out of Cyprian de lapsis, he citeth words against them, that [with defiled hands and mouths receive the Body, and drink the Blood of the Lord.] Words which Protestants have more frequently than Cyprian ; and are they on your side too ?

But shall Cyprian have leave to speak indeed ? Epist. ad Adagn. cap. 4. [when our Lord calleth his Body Bread,

congested by the adunation of many Grains, he sheweth the Union of the People whom he bare: and when he called his blood wine, expressed out of many bunches of Grapes and Kernels, and made up into one, he signified one Flock united, &c.]

And Epist. 63. *Ad Caelium de Sacram.* Proving that the Sacrament should not have water alone without Wine, he saith cap. 2. [That the Cup which is offered in commemoration of him be offered mixt with Wine. For when Christ saith, I am the true Vine, his blood is not water, but wine. Nor can his blood, by which we are redeemed and sanctified, be seen to be in the cup, if wine be not in the cup, by which Christ's blood is shewed, &c.]

And c. 6. we find the cup mixt which Christ offered, and that it was wine which he called his blood. whence it is apparent that the blood of Christ is not offered, if wine be wanting to the cup; nor is the Lords Sacrifice celebrated by due sanctification, unless our Oblation and Sacrifice answer his Passion.

And cap. 9. In the wine is shewed the blood of Christ, as in the water is understood the People. (Is the water turned into the People?)

And cap. 10. So the cup of the Lord is not water alone, nor wine alone, but must both be mixed; even as the body of the Lord cannot be meal (or flower) alone, or water alone, but both must be united, conjoined, and be bread by composition solidated.

And cap. 12. [As oft as we offer the cup in commemoration of the Lord and his Passion, let us do that which is manifest the Lord did.] So much of Cyprian.

V. The next cited by him is Tertullian, saying, [The flesh is fed with the body and blood of Christ, that the Soul may be made fat with God.]

Ans. I.

Ans. 1. The same we all say; even when we Administer the Sacrament: See the like in the *English Liturgy*, and the *Directory*: Are we therefore for Transubstantiation? 2. It is the *Representative body of Christ*; and not real flesh and blood: For he saith, that *he that eateth his flesh, and drinketh his blood, hath eternal life; and dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him, John 6. 54, 56.* But the wicked; that eat the body of Christ Representative, have not eternal life, nor dwell in Christ.

Another citation from *Tertullian* is *lib. de Idololat.* [*To touch the body of our Lord with those hands which give bodies to Devils, &c.*]

Ans. Here is no more than we commonly say: This Man sure would prove that the Liturgy and Directory are both for his opinion. Is this the Proof of Universal Tradition?

Reader, *Tertullian* calls it *The body of Christ*, and so do we. Will you hear him speaking his own Sense, which this Man concealeth?

Cont. Marcion, l. 3. c. 19. [*Sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut ex hinc jam eum intelligas corporis sui figuram pani dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem Prophetes figuravit, ipso Domino hic sacramentum postea interpretaturo.*] That is [For so God even in your Gospel revealed, calling bread his body, that so hence you may understand, that he gave to bread the figure of his body; whose body the Prophet formerly figured into bread; the Lord himself being afterward to interpret this Sacrament.] Here it is oft called bread; and this bread is called Christ's body, and the figure of the body given to bread it self, as was prefigured by the Prophets before Christ had a body.

And *Cont. Marc. l. 1. 14.* [*Nec panem (reprobavit)*

quo ipsum corpus suum representat,] [He reprobated not bread, by which he represented his own very body.] *Pamelius* hath no shift, but to say, that by representing he meaneth making present, such deceit will seem to prove to them *Universal Tradition*: And he citeth many other places, as for him, out of *Tertullian*, which have no more but his naming the Sacrament *Christ's body and blood*, as we all do.

Cont. Marc. l. 4. c. 40. He is yet plainer, saying [The bread which he took and distributed to his Disciples, that he made his body, saying, This is my body; that is, the FIGURE of my body: But it had not been the Figure of it, if he had not had a true Body. For an empty thing which is a phantasm, can have no Figure; or if he therefore feigned (or made) bread to be his body, because he wanted (or had not) a true body, then it was bread that he must deliver up for us: It made for *Marcion's* Vanity that bread should be Crucified. (All this is to prove against *Marcion* that Christ had a true body.) But why doth he call bread his body, and not a Pumpion, which *Marcion* hath instead of a heart, not understanding that this was the old figure of Christ's body, (N. B. had Christ flesh then?) who said by *Jeremy* [They have devised a Device against me, saying, Come, let us cast wood upon his bread; that is, the Cross upon his body] — so also making his Testament in the mention of the Cup, &c. And that you may know the old figure of his blood in wine, *Esaïas* saith, &c. so now he consecrated his blood in wine, who then figured wine in blood.]

Let any thing but ignorance and impudence judge, whether here be not over and over, bread and wine after Consecration, being the representative and figurative body and blood of Christ, or representing and figuring them fullier, as the Prophets had partly, or darkly done before.

But nothing will convince some that *rage*, and are confident.

I repeat Tertullian's reproof of the denyers of the certainty of Sense, *Lib de Annim. c. 17.* [*Therefore if Causes are freed from the infamy (of fallacy) how much more Sense, which Causes freely go before, &c. what dost thou procacious Accademick? Thou overturnest the whole State of Life; thou troublest the whole Order of Nature; thou blindest the Providence of God himself, as if he had made deceitful and lying Senses the Lords of all his works, as they are to be known, inhabited, dispersed, and enjoyed. -- It is not lawful for us to call those senses into doubt, lest in Christ we deliberate of the belief of them; Lest perhaps it be said that he falsely saw Satan cast down from Heaven, or falsely heard his Father's Voice testifying of him; or was deceived when he touched Peter's Mother-in-Law, or after felt some other Spirit of the Oyntment, which he received as to his Burial; and some other relish of the wine which he CONSECRATED for the MEMORIAL (or to be the Memorial) of his blood.*] So much for Tertullian.

VI. He next citeth Chrysostome, saying that Christ [*makes us his Body, not only in belief, but in very deed; and that we eat and touch his Body.*] *Answ.* And doth he not see how in citing these, he confuteth himself.
1. Christ doth really make *Us* his Body; that is, his Political and Mistical Body: But *is it we* that this Man would prove Transubstantiate into Christ's Body? I thought it had been the *Bread*, and not *Us*.

2. If we *touch Christ's Body* it must be his *Representative Body*; for the Papists hold that we *touch* not the *real Flesh and Blood of Christ*, but only certain *Accidents*, which now are not the Accidents of Christ's Body, nor of any other Substance.

It would be tedious to cite out of *Chrysostome* all that makes against them. Let these plain words serve to notifie his mind [*Epist. ad Cesar. The Bread is made worthy to be honoured with the Name of the Flesh of Christ, by the Priest's Consecration; yet the Flesh retains the properties of its incorruptible Nature, as the Bread doth its Natural Substance. Before the Bread is sanctified we call it Bread; but when it is Consecrated by the Divine Grace, it deserveth to be called the Lords Body, though the Substance of the Bread still remaineth.*]

Reader, This is the Tradition of the Church.

As to some Mens Cavil, that this Epistle is Spurious, it is fully confuted by Learned Men from sufficient Testimony.

VII. The next cited is a word that seemeth, in sound, to be for them, in *Cyril* (or some think *John*) of *Jerusalem's* Catechisme. Read the words Translated by himself; It is that Sentence which above all in the Ancients they most boast of, [*viz. Do not look on it as bare bread, and bare wine; for it is the body and blood of Christ: — For though thy Sense suggest this to thee, yet let Faith confirm thee: Do not judge of the thing by the taste, but rather from Faith hold for certain, so that thou hast no doubt that the body and blood are given thee; knowing and accounting for certain, that this bread which is seen by us, is not bread, though our taste judge it to be bread; but that it is the body of Christ: And the wine which is seen by us is not wine, but the blood of Christ.*]

Answ. Here I desire the Reader to note, 1. That this one Sentence is all that hath any words that sound like his Sentence (that there is no true bread and wine) of all that he bringeth to prove Universal Tradition. 2. That this Book called *Cyri's Cat. Mystagog.* is questioned. 3. That

the Author plainly declareth himself against Transubstantiation.

Which I prove, 1. The Assertion which he stateth is, that the *bread and wine* (for so he calleth them) are not [*bare, or meer bread and wine*] but Christ's *body and blood*; which we all assert: As the King's Statue in Brasse is not bare Brasse. 2. He next bids us not *judge by our taste*, that it is *bare bread*. And after when he saith *it is not bread and wine*, and appealeth to Faith from Sense, it is but his repeating of what he before asserted; meaning that though Sense perceives nothing but *bare bread and wine*, yet Faith perceiveth Christ's *body and blood*; and so it is not to be called *bread and wine*, for all proper denomination is from the *Form*; and the Form of a Sacrament is *Relative*, (as of a *Statue, Image, Symbol, Sign, &c.*) and it is *Relatively* Christ's *body and blood*: So that it is but, that it's *bare bread*, that he denyeth; as we do.

3, Most fully, he tells us his mind, *Cat. 3. p. 235.* [*For as the bread of the Eucharist after the Invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no more COMMON bread, but is the body of Christ; so also this holy Oyntment is no more meer Oyntment, nor (if anyone had rather so speak) Common, now it is Consecrated; but it is a Grace (or Gift) which causeth the presence of Christ, and the Holy Ghost; that is, of his Divinity:*] So that if you take him to assert the Transubstantiation of *bread*, you must say that he takes *Oyl* also to be Transubstantiate into *Grace*, or the Holy Ghost. For he saith, that *one is so as the other is changed*. That is, they are no more *meer or common bread*, or *Oyl*.

VIII. His last is out of *Iustin Martyr*, who saith [*we do not take these things as Common and ordinary bread, &c.*]

Ans.

Answ. 1. There is not one word in *Justin Martyr* here that we do not own, and say ; (nor do we desire to worship God by any other Liturgy, or Order of Worship, than that which he describeth as then the Practice of the Christian Church. O that we might all unite in that described Order !

2. And if any may be yet unsatisfied what Tradition saith, hear *Justin* farther, *Apol.* 2. (Truly the first) [*When the President hath given thanks, and all the People acclaimed, those that with us are called Deacons, distribute to every one present BREAD and WINE and water, and bring them to those that are absent.*] It is bread and wine when distributed.

And *Dial.* *Cum Tryph.* [*The Offering of Flower delivered to be offered for them that were cleansed of the Leprosie, was a Type of the BREAD of the Eucharist, which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded us to make in remembrance of his Passion.*]

Thus you see to what his boast of Universal Tradition is come.

Read but *Dallaus de Cultu Latinorum*, and you will see that there *Universal Tradition* was against them.

The foresaid Author of the Dialogue, called, [*Full and easie satisfaction which is the true Religion,*] to these forementioned addeth more, which you may read, pag. 140, &c. viz. *Irenaeus* laying, [*For as the bread which is of the Earth, receiving the Divine Invocation, is not now common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the Terrena and the Caelestial, &c.* Lib. 4. c. 34.

Origen in *Mat.* 25. calling it [*Bread, and a typical and symbolical body, which profiteth none but the worthy Receivers, and that according to the proportion of their Faith ; which no wicked man eateth, &c.*

Euseb. Cæsar. Demonstr. Evang. l. 1. c. 10. [*Celebrating duly the Memorial of the body and blood of Christ—Seeing we receive the Memorial of this Sacrifice, to be perfected on the Table, by the Symbols of his body and most precious blood—Lib. 8. He delivered us to use bread as the Symbol of his own body.*]

Ephr. (in Biblioth Photii, p. 415. Ed. August.) *The body of Christ which Believers receive, loseth not his sensible substance, and is not separated from the intelligible grace.*

And ad eos qui filii Dei, &c. [Take notice diligently, how taking bread in his hands he blessed it, and brake it, for a FIGURE of his immaculate Body; and he blessed the Cup, and gave it to his Disciples, as a Figure of his precious blood.]

Theodoret in Dialog. de Immutab. against an Eutychian, who pleaded, that Bread in the Eucharist was turned into Christs Body, saith, [The Lord who called that meat and bread, which naturally was his body, and who again called himself a Vine, did honour the Visible Signs with the Names of his Body and Blood; not having changed their Nature, but added Grace to Nature.] Can any Protestant speak plainer than this?

And Dial. 2. [The Divine Mysteries are Signs of the true Body.]

And further, answering the Eutychian, he saith, [By the Net which thou hast made art thou taken: For even after the Consecration the mystical Signs change not their Nature, for they remain in all their first SUBSTANCE, Figure, and Form, and are visible, and to be handled as before.] This is not plain enough for a Papist.

Nor Gelasius cont. Nestor. & Eutych. [Verily the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which we take is a
Divine

Divine thing, for which and by which we are made partakers of the Divine Nature; and yet it ceaseth not to be the SUBSTANCE and NATURE of bread and wine: And certainly the Image and similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ are celebrated in the action of the Mysteries.] O dark sayings!

[Cyril, Alex. in John 4. c. 14. [He gave to his believing Disciples fragments of bread, saying, Take, eat, this is my body.]

Facundus is there cited as from *Molinæus* (l. 9. c. 5. p. 404. though I have not the Author) saying [we call that the body and blood of Christ, which is the Sacrament of his body in the Consecrated bread and cup. Not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain the Mystery of his body and blood.]

To these I might add plain Testimonies out of most of the Ancients, who write on this subject: Such, e.g. as these words of *Gregor. Nyssen* Orat. de Baptis. As the Altar naturally is but common Stone, but being consecrated becometh a holy Table, an unspotted Altar; so the bread of the Eucharist is at first ordinary, but being mysteriously sacrificed, it is, and is called, The body of Christ, and is effectual to great things: And as the Priest who was yesterday a Lay-man, by the blessing of Ordination is made a Teacher of Godliness, and a Steward of the Mysteries, and though not changed in body or shape, yet is changed and made better as to his soul, by an invisible power and grace; so also by the same consequence water, being nothing but water of its self, yet blest by the heavenly grace, reneweth man by working in him the spiritual regeneration.

Is Stone in the Altar, or the Priest ordained, or water in Baptism transubstantiated?

If Charles the Great was a Heretick, the Pope is greatly

ly beholden to a Heretick. In his Epist. to *Alcunius* he saith, [*Christ at his Supper did break the Bread to his Disciples, and likewise gave them the Cup, in Figure of his body and blood; and so left to us this great Sacrament for our benefit.*] This was his Tradition.

Amalarius Præf. de Offic. Eccles. [*I am swayed in all that I write by the judgment of holy men and godly Fathers; yet what I judge my self I speak. Those things which are done in the celebration of Divine Service, are done in the Sacrament of the Passion of our Lord, as he himself commanded. Therefore the Priest offering the bread with the wine and water in the Sacrament, doth it in the stead of Christ; and the bread and wine and water in the Sacrament represent the flesh and blood of Christ. For Sacraments are somewhat to resemble those things whereof they are Sacraments. Therefore let the Priest be like to Christ, as the bread and liquors are like the body and blood of Christ.*]

[*The Sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner the body of Christ: For Sacraments should not be Sacraments, if in some things they had not the likeness of that whereof they are Sacraments. Now by reason of this mutual likeness, they are often called by that which they represent, — Sacraments have the virtue of bringing us to those things, of which they are Sacraments.*]

Walafridus Strabo de reb. Eccles. cap. 16., saith, [*Christ gave to his Disciples the Sacrament of his body and blood in the substance of bread and wine.*]

Bernard an. 120. Serm. de Purific. Mar. saith, [*The Body of Christ in the Sacrament is the food of the Soul, not of the Belly; therefore we eat him not corporally, but in the manner that Christ is meat, in that same manner we understand that he is eaten.* And *Serm. de S. Martin.*

The

The same Flesh is given us to this day, but Spiritually not Corporally.]

To conclude, If the words *This is my Body* are to be taken literally, then so are the rest; [*This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.*] And then the Cup is Transubstantiated into the New Testament.

And he that at once doth believe that Christ hath a Glorified Spiritual Body, that Flesh and Blood doth not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, that the Bread and Wine cease to be *Bread and Wine*, and are turned substantially into the very *Flesh and Blood* of Christ, and yet that the Pope and his Clergy are not Enemies of Christ and Souls, who deny this *Blood* to the People, and give them but a half Christ and a half Sacrifice, when he is praised by all Saints for washing them from their sins in his Blood, this Man and his Leaders seem to be Educated in such an Academy, as *Festus* thought *Paul* had been, and to be made by Satan the Stumbling-block of the unbelieving World, to perswade them to laugh at Christianity as we do at the Fopperies of *Mahomet's* Alcoran; and to make all the Nations of Heathens and Infidels believe that they cannot be Christians, unless they will be mad and senseless too: While Senses, Reason, Scripture, the History of the Church, and Writings of the Ancients, the Tradition and Judgement of the far greatest part of the Church, together with Charity, Humanity, and Peace, are all denied in obedience to *one Man*, that, because one Prince and his Clergy made him the first Bishop in his Empire and Councils, feigneth himself to be the Universal Monarch of the World; and undertaketh an Apostleship and Government at the Antipodes (when his zealous Bishops formerly some of them thought there was no such place,) and obligeth himself to the care of Souls farther than

Drake and Candish sailed, even in abundance of unknown Lands; and (as his Agents confessed to the *Abusives*) where his Missioners have no access.

The sum of all the History of this Matter is, The Fathers called it, as we do, sometime Christ's Body, and sometime the *Figure*, or representation of his Body, and often Bread: And from the *Name*, in the dark Age, the Thing grew controverted, and *France* was the chief Seat of the Contention: *Bellarmino* himself saith, that *an. 820.* [*Paschasius Ratbertus, an Abbot, was the first Man that seriously and capiously wrote of the truth of the Body and Blood of the Lord in the Eucharist against Bertram,*] who he thinks was one of the first that Wrote against it. *Bell. de script. Eccl. Johan. Parisiensis* and the Sorbonists concluded that neither Opinion was *de fide*: But the Pope chanced to be on the other, and the Council of *Trent* hath now made it *de fide*. *Qu.* Whether the Sorbonists knew not that Tradition which Parents teach their Children? nor any of those that were against *Ratbertus*?

But the Discourser pretendeth in the end to Answer Objections: But he first made them himself so thin, that he might not despair of saying something, which a Man deep in his Cups, or one that is little used to the Exercise of his Brain, might possibly take for a Rational Answer. But if the Reader be a Man that will be at so much pains to escape delusion, as to Read over the Arguments against Transubstantiation in the forementioned (little) Book of *R. B.* and then try whether he can here find them Answered; I may conjecture that he will not boast of the Discourser's performances.

He begins the Objection with a *[pathy doth was this]* *marvellous Change appears to our Senses; as well as other marvellous wonders as the Water turned into wine, &c.* *[The*

I confess it is strange *Flesh and Blood*, that no sense can perceive: But a *spiritual Body* may be out of the perception of our Sense. But did not the Discourser know, that it is another kind of Objection that we make? Not [*why doth not God shew us the Miracle to our Sense?*] but [*whether God deceive all our Senses and Intellect, which there perceive Bread and Wine, when there is none?*] It is not, whether Sense perceive Christ? but, [*whether Sense perceive Bread and Wine?*] It is not, whether Sense do *privatively* not perceive; but, whether it *here positively* erre, and the first *Intellective* perception of the sensible Object be an Error?

But under the Coats of this first part, he brings in a little of the true Objection at last, [*It would follow, that we might call in question the whole Mystery of Christianity, &c.*]

His Answer to all is, *By a distinction of Miracles; some are to convince Unbelievers; some to sanctifie and save Believers: And these are not to be the Object of our Senses.* He instanceth in *Baptism*, by which, as an outward and visible Sign, is wrought an invisible Grace in the Soul of the baptized; though view the Child as much as you will, you can by none of your Senses perceive any mutation wrought.

Ans. As your *Transubstantiation* seemeth devised to make *Infidels*, so doth your Doctrine of *Baptism* seem made to make *Anabaptists*. Is it by a *Miracle* that *Baptism* giveth Grace to the *Adult*, or not? If not, will not Men rather turn *Anabaptists*, than believe that *Infants* can have no Grace by *Baptism*, but by *Miracle*; when that Sacrament was instituted to give Grace to the *Adult* without a *Miracle*, and Scripture mentioneth no such difference of the Effects? But if it be by *Miracle* to the

Adult, is it not also by Miracle, that Men receive Grace by Reading, Preaching, or other means? You'll never prove one a Miracle, and not the other. And before we come to the Dispute between the Jesuites and some Fryars, the *Arminians* against some *Calvinists*, whether all Grace infused be a Miracle, we must bestow more time to agree of the definition of a Miracle, than is congruous to our present business. Overdoing is undoing: They that will make Men believe, that all Grace and Christianity is a Miracle, I doubt, do but drive men from the belief of all.

But this Discourser tells us, that *you see no change on a Child.* *Answ.* And is all a Miracle that is unseen? Is God a Miracle? Are Angels and all Spirits Miracles? Is the Soul of a Man, or of a Beast, or the Life of a Plant a Miracle, because unseen? Then all Grace however wrought is a Miracle; yea, and every thought of a mans heart both good and evil.

Is all a Miracle that is done by God alone, without second Causes? Then his moving the first created Motor were a Miracle. And yet who can say, that no second Cause is used in the conveyance of Grace?

But if you could prove that Word and Sacraments work Grace by miracle, you would make us less wonder that it is no more common: And here the Priest cannot do this Miracle when he will, for it must be on a disposed Subject: But your Priests can make *Bread* to be no *Bread*, by miracle, when they will. But *S. Paul* saith, *Are all works of miracles?* But how much greater Miracles your Priests are feigned to work, than the raising of *Lazarus*, or any such like; and how your feigned Miracles are confuted, is shewed fully by the foresaid Author.

But the Question, whether the Sacrament work by miracle,

miracle, is one, and that, whether it be *it self a miracle*, is another. Gods *workings* are secret to us, as the wind whose course we cannot describe, *Joh. 3*. But is the Sacrament it self a Miracle? The Word is not so: Baptism is not so: You feign not your Confirmation to be so: (though *Cyril* aforesaid make the change of the *Bread* and of the *Oyl* to be alike.) And is only this one Ordinance a Miracle?

But if it were, what's that to the positive deception of all our Senses?

He tells us of the Hypostatical Union, answered before: What Senses are deceived by that? Doth Sense judge that Christ was not God? Or that there is no Trinity? Or that a Virgin may not conceive? Not at all: Sense neither tells us that it is so, or that it is not. Therefore to tell us of things *hidden from Sense*, is impertinent. All the spiritual and noblest parts of Nature are out of the reach of our bodily Senses: But Sense is our only first perceiver of all its own proper Objects, and the Intellects first perception of them; is only as they are sensible.

But the only pertinent Answer given, is, [*we may alway trust our Senses about their own Objects, and in due circumstances, and when we have not positive grounds to think, either God Almighty by himself, or by an Angel, or permissively by a Devil, represents things otherwise than they are.*]

Ans. When things are represented otherwise than they are, it is either in other sensible qualities than they have, or else something else is under those qualities, than what they naturally signifie; or else it is by altering the Sense, Organ, or Medium. The first is a meer contradiction: To make an Object to be what it was not, is usual; but to make it at the same instant to be what it is not, is a contradiction. Therefore by representing you cannot rationally

nally mean this; *e. g.* To represent a rough thing as smooth, a *little* thing as *great*, a white thing as black, by real alterations of those qualities making them to be so.

But to make them *seem* so, when really they are not so, must be by the failing of the *Medium, Organ, Sense, Phantasie, or Intellect*.

1. And for the *Medium*, no doubt but God can so alter it easily, as to deceive all mens Senses: And in our present case, where all the five Senses of all the sound men in the World, that try, are pretended to be deceived, God is able to do it, by altering the *Medium* of every *Sense* that hath a *Medium*: (For whether *tactus* have any distinct from the Organ is undetermined.)

2. And the same is to be said of the *Organ, Sense, Phantasie, and Intellect*: *Quoad potentiam*, no doubt but that God that can annihilate them can deprave them when he please, and make a man senseless, deceived, doting, melancholy, or mad; either *privatively*, by withholding his necessary natural aids; or *positively*, by overcoming contraries.

But the Question is not, Whether God *can* do this *per potentiam*; but, Whether he *will* do it, or *can will to do it* in such case as ours, in consistence with his *Governing Wisdom and Goodness*, and that *Truth and Constancy* which he manifesteth in the Government of the World. That he may and doth penally make men senseless, mad, and dead, we doubt not; and that those that would not receive the love of the Truth, that they might be saved, may permissively be given up to strong delusions to believe a Lye! That all they might be damned that believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness; 2 Thess.

2. 11, 12.

Allen

But

But that God doth thus (not penally, but) as a *blessing*, and not upon mens forsaking him and his Truth; but while he is communicating *Himself* and *his Truth* to them; and to make a *Deceit* or *Lye* the ordinary Means of *Truth* and *Holiness*, and that he should do this ordinarily as the *Governour*, *Benefactor*, and *Saviour* of Mankind; and so make *Falshood* (not of his *permitting*, but of his own *effecting*) to be the ordinary way of *saving men*; all this is contradiction; contrary to his Will revealed in *Nature* and *Scripture*, and contrary to his Perfection; who needed not to Govern the World by Deceit or Lyes, as wanting neither *Power*, *Wisdom*, or *Goodness* to do otherwise: Grace consisteth in the *illumination* of the *Mind*, which revealeth Truth; and not in the *Errour* or *Deception* of the *Mind*, by deceiving the *Senses*. Gods Works of *Nature* discerned or perceived by our *Natural Sense* and *Phantasie*, and so by *Natural Apprehension* of the *Intellect*, are his *first way* of *Revelation*, in which he is most *clear* and *constant*. And we are *Men* and *Animals* before we are *Believers*, and *Faith* is grafted into the *Stock* of *Nature*, and *rectifieth*, *illuminateth*, *elevateth*, *perfecteth* it; but doth not destroy it, deprave it, deceive men, and make them mad or senseless.

But you tell us of many excepted Cases, in which God may deceive our Senses, or we may not trust them: No doubt; we may never trust them for that which belongs not to them, but is beyond them, (as to know whether God can assume *Flesh*, whether he can impregnate a *Virgin*, whether there be *Trinity* in *Unity*: There be many things that *Sense* is no Judge of, one way or other. But when there is an *Object* near us, duly scituate; which *Sense* was made to perceive, (as a *quantitative*, *sapid*, *odouriferous*, &c. *substance*) and there is no natural defect

in Medium, Organ, Sense, Phantasie, or Natural Intellect, to tell us of such excepted Cases, is, 1. To deface or slander the Providence of God, who Governeth by truth and order: 2. To make *Mercy* to consist in the subversion of Nature, and *Penal Acts* to be *gracious*. 3. To leave man utterly uncertain of every Article of Faith, yea, to bring in Scepticism, and leave us no certainty in the world. For if God may and do, in so many Cases as you name, deceive all the Senses and Perceptions of all men, even his faithfullest Servants in the World, by *Himself*, by *Angels*, by *Devils permitted*, how shall any man know when he doth otherwise? You say, [*till we have positive grounds to think these.*] But, if God can do thus, how can you tell that he doth it not without telling us, or giving us *positive grounds*? And who knoweth what those positive grounds are? Or that ever he read or heard a word, or saw a thing which you may call a *ground*? For if you know not *first* that the perception of Sense, and things sensible is true, you know not that ever you *heard any thing* to suspend your belief of them: Or that what you hear is true. And how will you prove against the Infidels, that God cannot Lye, or deceive us by a Prophet, an Angel, or a Voice from Heaven, or a Writing, if he can and do daily deceive all our Senses, about such Objects as they are made to perceive?

And what a War do you raise against the life of Faith, as if it had not difficulties enough without such? If you should set a Candle before Infidels or doubting persons, and say, [*If this be Light, the Gospel is false.*] would you be a Preacher of Christ or Satan? And if you set the Consecrated Bread and Wine before them, and say, [*See them, smell, taste, feel them, if this be Bread and Wine, the Gospel is false.*] would you not be the Preachers of infidelity?

But

But I must confider, that fo much being faid already in the forefaid *Dialogue*, which you give no Answer to, I must rather ftay till that be answered, than repeat it here.

But, at the leaft, you fatisfie us, when you grant, that *we must trust our Senses 'till we have positive grounds for the contrary*; and fo the Cafe before us is this: You fay, [*They that will be faved, must believe that God in mercy to illuminate mens minds, deceiveth all the sound mens Senses in the world (that try) about those things which naturally are the proper Objects of Sense, and duly qualified; and they must believe that there is no Bread or wine, when all their Senses present them as such to the Intellect, which necessarily perceiveth them as such as sensate; and they must believe, that to govern, illuminate, and sanctifie us by such deceit, God enableth every Priest, how ignorant and wicked soever, to veresie all the Contradictions before opened, and to work, as oft as he pleaseth, in every Mass above thirty Miracles, with many miraculous aggravations.*] And the proof of all this is, 1. That the same Christ that said [*I am the Door, the true Vine, the Shepherd, a Sower, a Husbandman, the Bridegroom, and spake ordinarily by Parables, and said in this same Sacrifice or Sacrament [This Cup is the New Testament in my blood,] and in all these is to be understood parabolically; yet saying at the same time [This is my Body] is to be understood literally, though St. Paul over and over call it Bread.*] 2. And this Exposition is delivered to us by the Roman Pope and his Clergie, and by some Priests in the Ninth and Tenth Ages, when their own Writers say, that their Popes were Monsters not to be named, and the Ages were for horrid Ignorance the Shame of the Church. And after that, 1215. a General Council Decreed it first, which also Decreed the extermina-

thin of all Christians as Hereticks, that will believe man's Senses herein, and the Excommunication and Deposition of all Temporal Lords, that will not exterminate all such Subjects, and the disobliging their Vassals from their Allegiance, and giving their Dominions to others: while yet the Judgment and Tradition of the far greatest part of the Christian World is against them, and the writings of the ancient Doctors of the Church, and the Pope and his Clergie dare not pretend to have received by Memory and Tradition an Exposition of the Bible, nor do give us any proof of their pretended Tradition of this one Text, that is considerable, besides their own bare word. This is the true Case.

POSTSCRIPT.

Since the Writing of this, I first saw *Larroques* French Discourse, and therein the Citation of *Joh. Parisiensis* Opinion about Transubstantiation, and the *Sorbonists* determination, that neither Opinion was *de fide*, and determined: And did they not then know Tradition?

Since that I have seen Bishop *Cousin's* History of Transubstantiation, which so fully proveth the Novelty of it, as against the Tradition and Judgment of the Church, and that by Fathers and many Councils, in all Ages till *Innoc. 2.* and even after *Petrus Blesensis*, and *Steph. Audenensis* (who first name it) and *Innoc. 3.* who first established it, few believed it in most Countries, as their own Authors confess; that I repented that I had needlessly medled

medled with the Citation of Authors, which is done by him so much better : And indeed such unanswerable Testimony is produced by him, (and that briefly in a small Volumn) to prove that the constant Judgment of the Church hath been against Transubstantiation, that I need not refer the doubting Reader to any other Book, nor provoke the Papists to try their strength upon any other : (Though *Hospinian*, *Usher*, *Chamier*, *Spalatensis*, *Albertinus*, and abundance more, have done it beyond all reasonable contradiction.)

FINIS.
